DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 738	LI 002 797
AUTHOR	Mitchell, David, Ed.; Choate, Beverly, Ed.
TITLE	Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, State University of New York at Albany, April 19-20, 1968. Proceedings.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	126p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Bibliographic Citations, Conferences, *Information Science, *Library Science
IDENTIFIERS	Bibliographic Control, *Library Science Literature

ABSTRACT

The discussions during the two-day sessions on the ten working papers which had been previously submitted to the attendees are reported. The formal high point of the Conference came during the small group work sessions which were not recorded. Each group reported the results of its discussions, in the form of recommendations, to the final full session of the Conference. The reports of the six work groups and the discussion at the final session were the basis for the final Summary of Recommendations issued by the Conference Editorial Committee. (In addition to these "Proceedings" see also: Summary of Recommendations, Short Summary of Papers and Proceedings, and the working papers, which are available as LI 002 796, 002 798 - 002 807.) A list of participants is included in this report. (AB)

ED050738

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature

State University of New York at Albany
April 19-20, 1968

PROCEEDINGS

Edited, from stenotype and audiotape recordings,
by David Mitchell and Beverly Choate. Albany, 1970.

NOTE: Remarks of all participants have been edited and, in a few instances, placed out of their natural sequence. Therefore, no participant should be held literally responsible for any of his remarks as they appear in this document.

LI 002 797

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION, April 19th: 9:30 AM. Jane Stevens, Moderator

Mitchell

After the thank-you's, all I have to offer before I turn the meeting over to Venable Lawson, is an apology. It's an apology for having a conference at all and particularly on this subject. I'm not one to foist a conference on anybody, and I'm not one to encourage undue introspection on the part of our field. I think there is enough of that. But looking at the focus we have on a subject which people never have come together to talk about, and looking at the fact that there is little or no literature on this subject, and at the fact that most of this group we have brought together have never been together before--I think there is some justification. So this is not really an apology; it's an apologia. And there will not be a conference next year on the same subject with the same people.

Lawson

I think gathering this type of group together to explore this idea is definitely an innovation in the way of a meeting. I think it is rather an embarrassment for our profession. Maybe we have been too concerned with literature in other areas to give full attention to our own. My job is to coordinate. We have two very strong moderators, thank goodness, and the moderators and I met last night to set up certain ground rules that we might follow through today's sessions. As you probably know, we will have reactions to the various papers first. These papers have been broken into two large groups. This morning we will give particular attention to the problems of the use and users of library literature; this afternoon, to the problems of bibliographic organization, services, and techniques.

Stevens

I have rather nebulous responsibilities. And if you look at this program--I don't know about Ed Holley--but anyone can recognize that it's impossible to moderate Dean Shera. I have no idea how the morning will work out.

The Dean here gets the first chance. And he will react to the first two of these five papers.

Shera

Thank you, Jane, for that introduction. I'm sure it's appropriate. I'm a little amazed by the array of top brass, from librarians, to academic vice-presidents, to coordinators, to moderators, to reactors, and working stiffs. I'm supposed to react to two of the papers and then go on from there, I guess, and say whatever I want to say.

The two papers assigned to me were the one by Bob Lee on standards and objectives for library school libraries, and Patricia Knapp's paper on the library-centered library school. I do think Bob Lee's paper is very well and very carefully developed. He argues strongly for a library school library as against a consolidation of the library school materials in the general collection. He gives some quite convincing arguments.

However, I think what Bob did is more relevant, perhaps, for the Committee on Accreditation than it is for this group. I can see his statement as an excellent backdrop for accreditation procedures, and I should think that the Committee would welcome this statement very much. It does give us a foundation and a yardstick for evaluating the kind of bibliographic resources a library school should have. But these, I think, are primarily administrative problems. They are not really problems to which we should be primarily addressing ourselves here.

Whether or not you have a separate library school library, I think, depends not only on your philosophy of what it should be, but on the situation on your own campus. If the library school is housed in the university library, for example, I can see much less reason to have a separate collection (although we do at Case-Western Reserve) than if the library school is housed, as at the University of Wisconsin, some distance away from the campus. It seems to me as if a separate library is almost unavoidable there, whatever your philosophy is. I don't think it will get us far if we spend our time arguing about this, although it might be fun to do it.

I would like to focus our attention--my attention particularly--on Pat Knapp's paper, which seems to me to lie very definitely at the heart of what we are concerned with this morning.

Pat's paper first argues for a library-centered approach to the library school library and the library school curriculum. This, I would assume, grows out of her very rich and very fruitful experience as librarian of Monteith College at Wayne State where, as you know, she developed a program in which the library was a very integral part of the educational process.[1] As some of you have, I'm sure, heard me say before, that Monteith experiment was one of the most original, and one of the most provocative and stimulating, things that's come out of academic librarianship in, well, you can name your own period of time, so long as it's long. I think what they did there was terribly exciting, terribly important. I've always regretted that it didn't go on longer than it did. Now she is, if I judge her paper correctly, reinterpreting this Monteith experience in terms of a library school. And, I think, since it made good sense in the total academic community, it also makes good sense in the library school situation.

Her five points, which she mentions at the very conclusion of her paper are ones that we need to think about, and we can summarize those five points, I think, by saying that the materials which the library school is using--the boundaries of those materials--are becoming greater and greater, extending over a wider and wider area. So the problem of defining what is the proper province of the library school library as against the total collections of the university becomes extremely difficult. As our education program in library schools becomes increasingly interdisciplinary, as I'm convinced that it must, all sorts of materials are becoming grist for the library school students' mill.

---

[1] Patricia Bryon Knapp, Monteith College Library Experiment, Scarecrow, 1966.

I remember, in the old days at the University of Chicago, when the Graduate Library School had its own collection, my old friend and mentor, Ralph Beals, was Director of Libraries and he was trying very desperately--because Chicago, as you know, is ranked next to Harvard in number of departmental libraries, something like twenty-four at the time when I was there--to get these various departmental libraries to define their objectives and their spheres of activity and their policies for the developing of collections. Most of them stuck pretty well to their knitting. The physicists stayed pretty close to physics--for physics and math were together. And the chemists stuck to their chemistry pretty well. But Beals had a series of charts, and the Library School was all over the map in the Library of Congress classification. And Beals finally said that as far as he could see the only guiding principles in acquiring materials for the GLS Library was, first of all, that the material must have nothing to do with libraries, and second, they must not add anything for which there wasn't already another copy somewhere in the system. Well, this is an extreme case, you see. Nevertheless, it was a kind of a foreshadowing, albeit not a very good one, but still a kind of foreshadowing of what Pat had been talking about.

And, of course, in a situation like this, the point of isolating a library specifically for the library school begins to break down. The whole collection is the province of the librarian. And I think that it's important that we take this concept very seriously, because if an educational program is to be library-centered, it seems to me that if there's any place where this ought to be given the strongest enunciation, it ought to be in a library school. I think we have in Pat's paper an excellent philosophical backdrop for what we want to talk about here. And I think we will --I'm sure we will--be coming back to it from time to time as our deliberations proceed.

I suppose at this juncture, then, it might be desirable to raise a few problems to feed into what my successors are going to say. It seems to me that our great problem is a problem of bibliographic coverage, bibliographic organization.

And again this comes out strongly, I think, when Pat talks about the organization of the literature. I would call it, myself, the structure of the literature, but we're saying the same thing basically. And I think what we need--the one big problem to which we need to address ourselves--is to develop this material, organize it, make it available so that we can keep ourselves informed of what is coming out.

We too much, I think, have suffered from the old adage of the shoemaker's children going barefoot. But in this, of course, we are at one with many other areas. I don't know whether many of you saw a recent issue of Science, the AAAS publication, on the efforts of the Pugwash Conferences to develop information services in the various fields of science.[2] The author, Bentley Glass, points out that this is one of the areas which he thought would be one of the easiest to encompass, internationally, and yet it is one of the areas in which the Pugwash Conferences have done the least. Every Pugwash Conference gets the problem out and talks about it and goes away, and the next year or two they get it out again and talk about it. And nothing ever seems to get done.

Eighteen years ago--almost eighteen years ago--I attended, at Paris, a Unesco conference, an international conference on bibliographic organization.[3] We did exactly the same thing. We talked about it; we said wouldn't it be fine if we had all this--and nobody did anything. Now I think one of the reasons that nobody gets anything done is that primarily the people who come to these conferences are not the people who are in a position to do anything about it. This came up repeatedly at the Unesco conference in 1950. We were all librarians, or bibliographers, or whatever you were, from a whole cluster of countries; but nobody there had any real responsibility to do anything. We couldn't do anything. We could only recommend, and that was probably the trouble with the Pugwash Conferences.

---

[2] Bentley Glass, "Pugwash Interest in Communications," Science 159:1328-1331, March 22, 1968.

[3] Jesse H. Shera, "Unesco Conference on the Improvement of Bibliographic Services; a preliminary report," American Documentation, 1:44-46, August, 1950.

I think here we have an opportunity because we have two agencies that are--well, more than two--we have several agencies that are already engaged in this. As far as the United States is concerned, we have the Wilson people here. We also have Wes (Simonton) on my left here from ERIC who is just getting into the ERIC problem. And then, of course, we have the British Library Science Abstracts. And so on. So we have brought into this group, I think, people who are in a position to do something, and I think that one of the best things that we could do is to try to give these people some kind of support, to try to coordinate these various activities.

We've got a good foundation on which to work--that's what I'm really saying--which many of the other disciplines don't have. I think that one of the best things we can do here is to develop this foundation and build on it a bibliographic structure that will bring to us the kind of bibliographic service that we're talking about and wishing for but somehow never seem to quite be able to make jell.

Let me turn it back to Jane.

Stevens

Thank you. We have one other service represented: Ben Lipetz, the editor of Documentation Abstracts. So we do have many people who are working in the field.

Ed Holley will now react to the other three papers.

Holley

I shall start off in good historical fashion by quoting one of the greats. John Shaw Billings, in a letter to Mrs. Billings, at the Montreal Conference on June the 9th, 1900, wrote: "There are about four hundred librarians here and probably there never were so many people together so thoroughly satisfied with their own knowledge." It's obvious if you have read all of the papers of this conference that this group is not as satisfied with its own knowledge. I have already said to a number of people that in my opinion the papers generally are of very high quality, and I think that we're fortunate in the thoughtfulness and in the general comprehensiveness of the preparation.

In commenting on Mrs. McFarland's paper, especially the issue raised about the monographic literature, I do think that this is probably easier to control than the serial literature, because we don't have that many good monographs coming out in a year in library science. Very probably some of this can be taken care of by better book reviewing, and we are going to talk about that in a few minutes.

While I quarrel with Mr. Little's analysis of reader interest, I doubt seriously that you'll come up with a much better random device than he has. He notes that monographs seem heavily used in proportion to the serial literature. I suspect this is because of the monographs he's selected and the importance and the publicity given to those selected.

On this high concentration of use in a few journals--the Belmont Conference noted that in American history everyone gets the American Historical Review and the Journal of American History,[4] and I suspect much the same thing is true of the journals that Mr. Little discovers get the bulk of the citations, Library Journal, CRL, and so on and so forth. If we're talking about research, of course, whether or not one can depend upon the top twenty--if you're serious about research--is another question. In other disciplines, people tell me, they need the more esoteric items because of the backlog problem. You can't publish in the mathematical reviews, so you publish in the Pacific Journal or something or other. I don't know whether this occurs in our field or not.

---

[4] Bibliography and the Historian, The Conference at Belmont of the Joint Committee on Bibliographical Services to History, May 1967. Ed. by Dagmar H. Perman. Santa Barbara, Calif., CLIO Press, 1968.

Now, Mr. Harris' paper on the fugitive literature in library science would tend to indicate that in terms of library history, some of the better items appear in historical journals and not in library journals. Using American library history as a case study, he says, as Dean Shera has already mentioned, that one of the major problems, certainly for library history, is the inter-disciplinary nature of the field. Research appears in many publications from various publishers, some of them very little known among librarians.

Mr. Harris suggests that we will probably continue to see serious problems in controlling the literature of American library history, and I could not agree more. It is obvious that we cannot ignore the non-library science bibliographic tools in searching for American library history. Unfortunately, the Belmont Conference, in which American historians rather thoroughly explored their own needs in this area of bibliographic control, suggests that the tools in other fields may not be adequate either.

There are some hopeful signs. Some specialized bibliographies are appearing, including Mr. Harris' own research guide, which was published last month.[5] American library history, as Mr. Harris suggests, could certainly be improved by a critical essay on each year's work in the field. He suggests the need for a comprehensive retrospective bibliography for American library history; and I suspect that, for the historians among us, this is far more important and far more difficult to achieve than a current awareness service.

---

[5] Michael H. Harris, Guide to Research in American Library History, Scarecrow, 1968.

And then he speaks at last of the deficiencies in collecting original materials. This is a problem that, for the number of library school librarians with us, does need consideration, especially the preservation of the manuscripts of prominent librarians. Librarians have been particularly uninterested in collecting documents about themselves. This may be our humility showing through. I don't know. It does take a fair amount of ego to believe your papers are worth collecting. Nevertheless, there are a lot of papers getting away from us that we will never be able to do anything with. I remember with what horror a couple of years ago I heard Mr. Joseph Wheeler comment that he had spent the previous summer burning several barrels of his manuscripts, and this is more the rule than the exception. I told him to go his way and sin no more, but I don't know that he followed that advice.

The chief culprits are those of us who are practicing librarians and library administrators, who fail to report what we already have to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections. And being one of the chief offenders, I certainly suggest that we all do something about it. Mr. Harris makes brief mention of oral history. I don't see much future in that for librarians. I think it's going to be very expensive and not likely to be very productive at this stage of the game.

There is also a problem of deficiency in terms of annual reports. It may interest you to know that the ACRL Publications Committee is changing the nature of the Microcard Series. It is very likely that annual reports will be collected in a new series, probably on microfiche. And so we may be closer than we think to solving that particular problem.

I want to come back to the retrospective bibliography problem and the need for comprehensive retrospective bibliography. I am really amazed at how good Cannons is, although it's far from complete.[6] I think anybody who's ever used it for serious work is just amazed that this bibliography came out as well as it did. As the Belmont Conference suggested, every historian must be his own bibliographer. And one thing that came through in at least one paper of that conference was the fact that historians really don't want anybody else to be bibliographers for them--which says something about abstracting, and current awareness services, and things of this nature. This would certainly fall in line with my observation of historians as a breed. And Mr. Harris, in effect, has pointed up that we have no real choice: whether we want to or not, we have to be our own bibliographers.

---

[6] H. G. T. Cannons, Bibliography of Library Economy, Classified Index to the Professional Periodical Literature in the English Language, 1876-1920, Chicago: ALA, 1927.

I do want to come back to his suggestion that we have an annual review of the literature of American library history. Dean Shera had a review twenty or twenty-five years ago in Library Quarterly, which is far and away the finest thing that's ever been done in terms of a bibliographic essay. I think that we have not had generally in librarianship very much of that kind of thing. I heartily agree with Mr. Harris' suggestion that critical essays each year would help. It would be a nice thing to restore and make more complete the old Year's Work in Librarianship (1928-1950). We've had "the annual review of" and "progress in" for a lot of different areas. I suspect that it would be in some ways easier to achieve an annual state-of-the-art kind of thing than it would be to achieve the library sicence counterpart of Psych Abstracts, although neither would be cheap. I noted that the new Annual Review of Information Science and Technology had a nice grant from the National Science Foundation. One of the problems was selecting a good editor, as is always true in this kind of thing. The quality usually varies with the editor, and then the editor always has the problem of trying to find somebody who can write literately and who can pull together a lot of stuff in good fashion. That isn't easy to discover either. But I would hope that in this conference we address ourselves to that particular problem.

Harris

There have been some recent developments in regard to a number of things Mr. Holley said.

First of all, there will be an annual review of the literature of American library history published in the Journal of Library History each year. The first one, which I wrote, will appear in the October issue. We're attempting this on a kind of experimental basis and hope that if it's useful to members of the profession that they'll make it known to the editors. The one that will appear this fall describes some forty-four items that were published in the past year, a good number of them in non-library periodicals and books that wouldn't usually come to the attention of librarians.

Secondly, in relation to the comprehensive bibliography, I think there is some progress being made there, too. Dr. Zachert of the Journal of Library History has become quite interested in this project. Right now what we're trying to do is develop state bibliographies, a number of which will be published in the Journal of Library History in the future. I'd recommend to you all the possibility of working on the bibliography of library history in your own state. The idea as I see it will be to compile these and update them when they've all been published, and then put them together in book form. Right now, one will appear on Pennsylvania library history in the next issue of the PLA Bulletin. Dr. Libbey at Southern Connecticut State College is working on Connecticut. Dr. Zachert is working on Georgia and Florida. And it looks like Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma are going to be covered, but that leaves everything else. If anybody is concerned with these areas, I'm sure that Dr. Zachert at Florida State University will be glad to hear from you. If you have students or faculty members back at your library schools who might be interested, you might bring this to their attention.

Stevens

Thank you. We will now consider the papers as the background and move on from there and focus directly on the main topic of the conference, bibliographical control. This morning our chief assignment is to find out what the profession needs. As you know, that isn't exactly clear. But hopefully we can determine some of our specific needs. We have the background from the papers behind us now, and now we work toward some of the suggestions they've made.

I have no idea how this discussion is going to go and perhaps I am being pessimistic, but we decided it might be helpful if we declared two subjects completely off limits for this morning. One is one of my own pets: that is, the curriculum of library schools. Let nobody mention that today. I don't think we'll ever get anywhere else if they do. And I would also hope that we leave any discussion of terminology and let them worry about that this afternoon.

Since we have to start with something, and something rather specific, we thought the problem of book reviewing might be a good specific problem to discuss first. It has been mentioned in several of the papers. It's also mentioned in some of the afternoon papers. It is, of course, where the interdisciplinary problem can be attacked if we can approach some of the literature through book reviews. There is a general feeling that the book reviewing in library science literature is not adequate. This is, I think, a fairly common criticism. So it would seem to me that we might start by trying to work towards some rather specific proposals for improvement in this one segment of the bibliographical control of our literature.

Atherton

We can't really go on unless we question who is the user or try to get some consensus. One of the papers--I guess Little's--tried to say that he thought it was the professional librarian and the library school student who is the user of library science material. (Now, I question that assumption, but let's stay with it). If these are the users, they should also be the reviewers of the material.

This is a very personal comment that I am going to make. I'm sitting right next to the book review editor of American Documentation. Two years ago he gave me something to review, and I have not reviewed it. There is pressure in other fields, pressure to publish (I know most about some of the scientific fields, having worked for them). We've heard it called "publish or perish." The brownie points that the scientists get for publishing keeps them under pressure to write book reviews, to publish literature in their fields. I don't know of a comparable pressure, except that which I can impose upon library school students when I require a term project. We don't require that of our professional leaders or, for that matter, for professional promotions. That may be part of the problem. Take someone like me who is very interested in the literature and would like very much to review it--and yet here I am two years behind in meeting Ted Hines' request to review Ranganathan's work in which I am very interested.

We may be going to the wrong people. You tend to go to the people you think will write the best reviews, but if they're the busiest, they may let it slide because of the pressure of more immediate work. So I think whoever is responsible for book reviews at the present time, the book review editors, need to say why they go to whom they go for reviews and what results they have been getting. This is my own personal expression of guilt.

Hines

Being on both sides of this, I assure Mrs. Atherton that I am as guilty as she is. But I do think I might say something on behalf of the people who try to get reviewing done. I have had to appeal twice in American Documentation for library school faculty to undertake to provide the reviews for a particular issue of AD. And I had one issue of AD composed entirely of student reviews from my own class where I could turn the screws down.

The delay in getting something back from reviewers within the profession (and, as I say, I am as guilty as anybody in this respect) is so great that I am really tempted, in order to get reviews out in time, to do what I have been actually forced to do because nothing has come into me--to use only the Columbia community, which is a bad mistake in some respects, but in other ways it's the only way in which I can be sure to get the reviews back and get things reviewed reasonably promptly.

Furthermore, I think everyone has the problem of obtaining review copies, except possibly Library Journal. I don't, personally, have the staff support to do the kind of solicitation of review copies which I would like. This accounts for the spotty nature of the reviewing. In addition, there is the well known time lag. For *American Documentation*, the publication time lag is approximately six months after I send my stuff in on the appointed date. This means that there is no timely reviewing in *American Documentation*. *Library Journal*, and other journals with faster schedules, can do better in this respect.

I would hope that Mrs. Atherton might inspire some of you to volunteer to do some more reviewing for me, and for other people.

Stevens

Mrs. McFarland, are reviews of any help to you in your acquisitions, or are they too little and too late?

McFarland

Well, of course they are helpful. But for the librarian who has only a limited amount of time to purchase some of these books, I think the reviews don't come out fast enough in general. Most of the time I seem to end up simply working with citations and gambling on whether I'm going to waste money or not. Maybe some of the other practicing librarians have some good advice on this.

Herling

I'd like to know if anybody knows how many books we're talking about. It seems to me that the number of monographs, strictly monographic type publications, in library science is relatively limited. If you go into the technical reports, then of course you have a great deal more. But I would think in a library school library you would buy everything published in the field and not depend on reviews at all. Perhaps you would want them as examples of bad writing.

Stevens

I want to say one thing. I think there are many more monographs in library science than most people realize. I get the proof slips of the Z section of LC, and I think I have received about a hundred and fifty since January. Now, LC is cataloging everything, including, I think, a fourteen page reprint of a article from their own *Quarterly Journal*, which I was rather surprised at. But I have a sizable stack of slips representing monographs.

McFarland

My thanks to Jane Stevens for saying that there were so many monographs. I think that is true. I *do* consider many of the technical reports as monographic literature, especially for acquisition. I would estimate that there are probably over 2,000 citations a year, counting the technical reports. If anybody would like to contest that, that's perfectly fine. It's just a guess on my part.

Atherton

I think reviews may have a limited function for acquisition purposes, especially if the library school is trying to be comprehensive. But I would like to explain my use of reviews and encourage the librarians of library schools to do the same. And that is, I xerox the review and insert it in my own copy so that, when I give the book to a student, he sees what has been said about the book. In the area of evaluation of reference retrieval systems, for instance, the reviews of the Cleverdon Cranfield Project are sometimes more valuable than Cleverdon's own work for seeing something about the state of the art and also about the critical comments that are coming from it.

Holley

I want to comment on that. I think that, for some of us who are not connected with library schools but are practicing librarians, the book reviewing does quite something else again. We use it to keep up with what's going on and to know whether there is something we simply have to read. Or sometimes we can scan the review and know quickly and fairly well whether we can pass it by, or file it away for sometime when we may need it. Book reviewing just for the purpose of acquisition doesn't help me very much, because here again I suspect our library acquires most of the things that are published whether they are good or bad, and most large libraries do. From the Belmont Conference, again, we know the historian uses reviews particularly for areas in which he is only peripherally interested. This keeps him up very nicely with some area where he'd like to know what's going on without really having to read everything that comes out.

I think we have ignored the value of reviews, and it may be because the quality of the reviewing has declined so much in the last few years. I'm interested in Mrs. Atherton's comment on the difficulty of getting good reviewers. I'm baffled by this in a profession that has so many people in it who presumably are capable of decent reviews. Look at other disciplines. They review, for instance, in the case of the Journal of American History, a hundred monographs each issue. And this is a quarterly. Four times a year--that's four hundred books a year. I doubt that American historians greatly outnumber librarians. So there is something here that needs to be touched upon. We need to improve.

I wonder if Mr. Hines' comment on the fact that the book reviewing editor is generally a part-time non-paying proposition with little staff support is not the crux of the matter. If the major journal in the field, which is distributed far and wide to most librarians, had a good book reviewing editor who could over a period of time, develop a fairly good stable of book reviewers, then we might get this problem taken care of, leaving the specialized journal to review only those items of great interest to its particular area. This is what, of course, Library Resources and Technical Services does. It reviews only those items that are directly applicable to its areas of interest. I suspect that the largest portion of professional reviews ought to be in Library Journal and that Library Journal ought to have a good book reviewing editor for the professional literature. The improvement of that one journal would do more than anything else to get us out of this bind. Library Quarterly, which is terribly behind, remains our best critical book reviewing journal. You can read, generally, a Library Quarterly review and know what's bad about a book as well as what's good about it. So I think we need to tackle this at the very source, and I would suggest Library Journal is the place to tackle it.

Batty

Reviewing is obviously very much a post-publication way of learning about anything at all. By definition it can't really ever be used as current awareness if you happen to be that far behind. And obviously, then, one of its greatest uses is evaluation.

It seems to me that this reflects on a point about the user of this field. We use the word "librarian," in two different ways. It's like the use of the word "bibliography," because you're never quite sure what that means either. Is it in fact the study of books, or is it the control of books? That kind of thing. Here we're talking about literature for librarians, but we haven't really decided whether they're librarians-as-librarians or librarians-as-readers of library science literature, which is a different thing altogether.

Are they on one hand librarians who are collecting material so somebody else can use it--that is, functioning as librarians do for any field, as they do for fields like chemistry and physics and literature? Or are they functioning as the professionals do in their own field--that is, interested in their own literature and wanting to read it?

Jesse Shera has mentioned already the cobbler's children going barefoot. We all agree, and I think this is the thread that runs through the papers that we've all read, that the services that we use to look after and look through our own literature are not as good as they might be. But then who is to blame? Have we not demanded enough? Have we not given our own expertise to this particular field? Or is it the other way around, and we're all guilty, not librarians-as-librarians, but librarians-as-readers, because we don't care enough to read enough of our own literature?

I'm not sure how relevant it is in this country. Maybe it isn't at all. But at home when anybody leaves practicing librarianship and goes teaching he is sent off with a wail of misery and farewell because he never returns to the practice of the profession again. And all the practicing librarians say, "But how will you keep up with what goes on in the field?" And yet it's an observable fact in England, at least, that it's the people who teach in library schools who know more about what goes on, because they have to read the journals. And practicing librarians on the whole are noticeable in not reading them quite as much as they should.

It may be that this carelessness about wanting to read their own literature at the same time that they encourage everybody else to read theirs is behind some of this weakness. And it may be that this difference between librarians-as-librarians and librarians-as-readers has something to do with it.

Lawson

Who is this user we are concerned with? This seems to be the crux of the problem. We speak of "librarian." That's a very generic term. Well, obviously the library school students are one group. The library school teachers are another. Even the library administrator, if he isn't keeping up generally, is at least turning to the literature on occasion for the answer to pragmatic problems. Then there are scholars in librarianship. There are some at this conference. An then I think there is the interested librarian who wants to know what is going on in the profession. These are the various audiences that I have identified off-hand. Maybe now we can identify their handicaps, their real problems. We've got to think about how effective we are at present in meeting the needs of these specific groups.

Shera

I'd like to talk about quality, because I think the points raised about the librarian-as-librarian and the librarian-as-reader are very important. I must confess that I myself, whether I am typical or not, am primarily a librarian as a reader rather than as a librarian. And I read reviews to see whether or not I want to buy the book. (I hate libraries. I don't use a library book if I can possibly get around it. They're a damned nuisance. You can't take it, or you can take it but you can't mark it up. You've got to get it back at a certain time.) But the thing that disturbs me about this--this has already come out, but I'd just like to underscore it a little bit more--is the quality of the reviews. And I don't think librarians are alone in this.

The quality of reviewing in this country generally is pretty low. The New York Times Book Review, for example, is pretty bad when you compare it with a thing like the Times Literary Supplement, where they really roll up their sleeves and go to it. The only trouble with the Times Literary Supplement is you've got to have 20/20 vision to read the damn thing. I wish they'd do something about their typography. They've extremely good reviews, but they're unsigned so you never know who's talking--that's my other quarrel. But still these people take it extremely seriously, and it's a terribly exciting thing to read. We don't have anything like it in this country, and particularly in the library field.

Even the reviews in our own Library Quarterly have deteriorated recently. I don't know why. Certainly under Leon Carnovsky and Bill Randall the reviews were better. I know Leon worked particularly hard at this. He had a stable of reviewers. He really spent an awful lot of time, and the reviews showed it. These were critical reviews. One of the quarrels I have with the library reviewing media is that too many of the reviews are uncritical. Somehow, to write a critical review is something no nice guy does. You know, it isn't quite right for colleagues to tear something apart. I think this is awful.

I've gotten into deep water myself twice. I've been threatened with law suits on reviews. This, to me is ridiculous. One of my books got a very critical review in the Times Literary Supplement, and it never occurred to me to sue the London Times. I mean this is ridiculous. And yet, even if suits aren't threatened, you're stigmatized as being kind of a nasty guy, you know. This is very unfortunate, particularly if it's a book turned out by one of the "giants" of the profession. You just don't review his book critically, even though lord knows some of them need it. I wish we could do something about these standards of critical evaluation. It's awful, I think, that this has gotten into our mores--that we've got to praise things just because we don't want to hurt anybody's feelings. I've got one coming out in a month, a couple of months or whenever they get around to publishing it, in the Library Journal. I don't know whether I'm going to have a third suit on my hands or not, but it was a lousy book. It was terrible. It was full of errors. And I said so. I think a reviewer, if he takes his job seriously, has an obligation to do this.

Ted Hines mentioned that one time he had his students do his reviews because he could crack the whip over them and get them in on time. This is certainly true, but I think there is another point to be made there, too. Students by and large are much more apt to take a reviewing job seriously than somebody who is a "leader" in the profession, who is busy as all get-out and dashes the thing off. "It's written by Joe, and Joe's a nice guy, and I know him, and so I'll say a few inanities about it, and that'll get rid of it." We used to find when we were students at Chicago that the best reviews were done by the students in the GLS because we really worked at it. We took it seriously, and I suppose sometimes we tried to show off our erudition, and so on, and catch the author up on something. But still I think you get a much more serious attitude toward reviewing from a group like that. The main weakness, of course, is they don't always have all the background that they should have.

I wish we wouldn't take reviews so casually, because I think they're terribly important, and I think people ought to really work at them and try to strive for what the Times Literary Supplement does. It's unfortunate, the mores that we've developed about reviewing.

Harris

I suffered a good deal of discomfort in thinking that reviews should be defined as a means of bibliographic control. I don't see it that way. I may be wrong here, but I look at reviews in a completely different manner, as a means of evaluation. And for this reason, I frankly don't get really upset about the currency of the reviews. I think we're going to have to look to some other place, LC proof sheets, for instance, as a means of bibliographic control as opposed to trying to push book review editors and journals into attempting to get these reviews out while they're current. I would like to think that there was some other way for us to establish bibliographic control for library science literature than through reviews which should be critical, as Dean Shera suggests, and should be written carefully, and for that reason would probably be a good deal later than the publication of the book.

McFarland

Although it's true that one cannot use the reviews for bibliographic control, I don't really agree that a library school library should end up buying everything just because it happens to be there. There are a lot of awfully bad things I've bought that I wish I had not bought, even as examples of horrible writing. We end up with enough of those as it is, and I would like to be able to cut down on the amount. But I do admit that one cannot use the reviews for bibliographic control.

Batty

I'd like to take the point that Mike Harris made even further. I think I would be very uneasy if I felt that reviews were my only or my chief means of becoming aware of literature. I think if they are an awareness service at all for me then it's in the nature of a kind of impulse buying, because I see a review that makes me take notice of something.

But the point I'd like to extend is that if reviews are going to be evaluative, there is the danger that they become explanatory; and that encourages people, as so often happens, not only in our own field but in other fields as well, not to read the book. They read the review, and then they think they've read the book. The point about a review is that it's evaluative only if you read the book as well. This habit of not reading the book but reading the review instead is a very dangerous one. Perhaps Dean Shera's suggestion is the one we should follow and just make the reviews abusive, provocative and everything else--but incomprehensible unless you then go and take the book and read it to see just what he's been abusive and provocative about.

Knapp

I want to go back to the problem of the interdisciplinary aspect of librarianship and to what Mrs. McFarland said about using book reviews for selection. As people have said, you get good, bad, and indifferent if it's pure library science materials; but evaluation of the peripheral, where we cut over into other areas, may be indeed a significant factor in acquisition outside of pure library science. This, I think, also applies to those of us who use reviews to keep up with what's going on in the world. I can say that even as a teacher in a library school who may have the opportunity to read widely, and may be responsible about it, and may have the time, it's pure chance when I run across other things which it seems to me are quite relevant to library science but which aren't identified as such. Now, if our professionals, the librarians who are librarians, are parochial about the few things in library science they read, they are even more parochial about getting outside of library science. I think it would be good if we could have reviews which brought in the things which were relevant from outside library science in something like Library Journal which a lot of librarians read.

Batty

Reviews, as Pat Knapp just said, should really take in far more than the core of library science. Now this is something we haven't really discussed yet. What area is it that we're talking about? In a number of the papers there is mention of library science as a service discipline, of this field as an interdisciplinary field, of the core and the fringe. I think one of the things we could well consider is not only the nature but, as it were, the shape of the field.

For instance, I think it is very important to remember that it is a service discipline. There is an outside community that library science itself serves and, therefore, its literature discusses. So that the things we, librarians-as-readers, will read about our own field will discuss that outside community. Then inside that is the core, if you like, a kind of technology of disciplines like cataloging, classification, bibliography--things like this, the heart of library science we all know about. And within that--inside--are those subjects, those areas, that are transmitted by this service discipline of library science outside to that community.

If you drew this as a kind of diagram, you would get a curious topological figure that it's most easy to describe as a doughnut because you have the hole in the middle which is not really library science but contains all the disciplines that library science transmits. And then you get library science itself surrounding it. (I'm not sure if it should be a doughnut or a kind of hollow sphere, but perhaps a doughnut's easier.) And then outside that the community itself. Now, we know about, or at least we think we know something about, our own discipline--that's the jam of the doughnut somewhere in the middle--but what we need to know much more about is the stuff which is on the outside fringe, the community, the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of the need to know, the context of demand, if you like, and also on the inner fringe, the epistemological interpretations or treatments of the knowledge itself.

Whether we have current awareness services, indexing services, abstracting services, reviewing services, better or worse than we have now, seems to me only as important as the recognition that we should extend them to cover the things beyond those that we could fairly easily get hold of by talking to other people. I'm sure we all recognize that this business of conferences, for instance, is where you get around and talk, where you don't bother to go into the papers. There's more information passing, more information transfer, at the bar at a conference than there is in the conference hall itself. And most of us, I suppose, after the two or three days here will go back knowing much more about what's going on in the field because we've talked to the people who are actually writing it or reviewing it or something of that kind. What we don't know, however, because we are all specialists here, is the stuff on the fringe that supports this field, and that feeds it; and in its nature as a service discipline this may be even more important then it would be in any other conventionally structured discipline.

I'm going on too long.

[There is no record of the remarks of the next few speakers. The subject under discussion shifted from book reviewing to annual reviews. When the record resumes, Mrs. Atherton has just explained the manner in which a central editorial office had gathered a list of citations for the use of chapter writers for the third volume of the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*. This list had been a great help, but she and her co-author still had to scan the whole list line-by-line because they found that they could not trust the KWIC index that had been constructed from the titles of these citations. Her chapter was "Professional Aspects of Information Technology."]

Atherton

The other important thing to remember is that although there were 2500 references that I scanned line-by-line, I still, in preparing for my work, found another sixty or seventy that had not been found by the central office. These were in some of our core journals. And then there were reports and things that came to me which the editorial office probably would have had trouble getting. Without my graduate assistants at Syracuse, I would never have attempted the *Annual Review* chapter. They pulled out and xeroxed all the copies of articles and got the books ordered and the reports coming in by air-mail. It is these burdens, reference retrieval and document retrieval, that have to be removed from the chapter writer who finally gets all the material in one place and organizes it according to the outline of his review chapter.

Becker

I'd like to underscore what Pauline has said. I too was a chapter writer for Volume III of the *Annual Review* and have had similar experiences to hers. But, Jesse, in terms of supporting bibliographical organization, what I found to be true in Chapter Thirteen was that, although I was able to use a good many of the references that the editor provided, more than half the references that I ended up with were materials that weren't covered in his bibliography and represented current data that flowed across my desk in the form of publications. Consequently, this information is going to appear in the October Annual Review and will constitute, I suspect, a summary of data which will be very, very current rather than retrospective.

Stevens

Are there any other comments on the value of an annual review to the library science profession?

Lazorick

I just want to comment, then, that maybe there is a need for a current awareness service--at least for chapter writers for the Annual Review.

Atherton

I have to say something negative about the Annual Review in case someone else doesn't want to. I tried to use it with students, and it flopped. Because you can't read these chapters full of references and only a few comments if you don't have some of the background in the field. And I'm sure this would be true of professional librarians as well. I was shocked. I even gave it to an expert in the field of computer-assisted indexing. And he hadn't been keeping up with the literature--he was just too busy developing his own system--and when he read the chapter on Content Analysis, Specification and Control, he said, "This is not understandable," because he literally didn't have anything to bring to it himself.

So that we have to remember that this is a tool for the specialist who does want to keep current, who has read some of the material, and wants to have highlighted for him the things he's missed, or that he may not have kept up with, during the past year. So that it may have a very limited audience if it's treated the way the present Annual Review is and is limited in the number of pages and the amount of space that you have to discuss any one item.

Shera

This is an interesting point, because we've said that one of the important functions of the annual review was to inform somebody about an area that was related to his, but in which he was not an expert. Now you're saying he's got to be an expert in order to understand the review. There's something putrid in Peru here somewhere.

Atherton

Jesse, it is just a reference retrieval document. All it will do is highlight your interest in something because it is in focus with something you may know about. That is why I was interested in the second experiment last year which was called the Information Science Literature Display, which brought together all the hard copy of all the references in Volume II of the Annual Review.

Luckily my friend Stella Keenan was in charge of the display, and I said the minute you're through with it at ADI in October, send it up to Syracuse. So we had it for a two month period, and I could watch my students use the collection of documents that had been screened and reviewed in the Annual Review. They would sit down and pour over those shelves that now brought everything together, whether it was a journal article, a technical report, a book on the subject of, say, library automation. They could just flip through it, go back to the Annual Review, see what Barbara Markuson had to say about it; and quite often they disagreed with her. It was a different kettle of fish entirely. So I'd suggest that along with an annual review, you have a microfiche collection of the documents.

Shera

A package. I think this might make sense.

Batty

I'm sure we all agree on the excellence of the idea of an annual review. I'd like to make a small point--a comment--that excellence carries its own penalties, as can be seen in Five Years' Work in Librarianship.

Year's Work in Librarianship was, for years, a marvelous tool that everybody used with very great profit. Five Years' Work came about partly because Year's Work was too much of a burden to get out every year. And it was then thought possible to bring out a quinquennial summary of the activities. The 1960-65 volume of Five Years' Work in Librarianship is still not out. I've observed part of the activity that's been going into this, because a friend of mine was writing one of the chapters. His problem has been that his own efforts (and he isn't aided by all kinds of machines and systems, because we don't work that way in England), his striving for excellence, delayed the completion of his chapter. He, as it happens, finished his chapter a good deal before many of the other people did, and that was something like two and a half years after the end of that particular period.

It may be that we should inquire into methods of speeding up this kind of publication. I suspect, however, that we should have to accept delays of this kind, relying on an annual review as we might rely on the other kind of review (and Pauline made this distinction) to give us hindsight evaluation, post mortem. It should be only, as Jesse Shera said, one of the points, the nodes, in some kind of total network of controlling information, of disseminating information.

Osborn

Two points I would like to make in this connection, about the annual reviews.

In my new school, the computer-based classification had as one of its principles that the material that opened up the subject should come first. And so serial bibliographies first; second, monograph bibliographies; and, third, state-of-the-art publications. Well, state-of-the-art publications are very sadly lacking in our field. They occur primarily in other areas, and so this does point up the need for an annual review.

The second thing is, if we are concerned with truly graduate study of our professional work, then we should be doing two things: one, working with primary sources; and the other, working with material from a state-of-the-art point of view. But we shouldn't be doing what the card catalog does, what Library Literature does--just leveling everything off. We should know the school of thought to which a person belongs. We should know what the value of a precise contribution might be. And here again, if we're going to use secondary sources, we should have a state-of-the-art point of view.

Stevens

We certainly have clear sentiment that more bibliographies are needed--annual and retrospective. There is one other bibliographical question. Is an annual review enough? Does the profession need a current awareness service? In the papers for this morning, there were statements that the profession did not need rapid information. There were statements that the profession did. This note I have from one of the auditors here indicates that at least the library school librarians would like to know about publications before they happen, so they can acquire them. Could we have some discussion on the value to the profession of current awareness? Is it something we think we want but we don't really need to have? Is it something we really need and have not recognized?

Lawson

I wonder about inclusiveness: certainly we would include the periodical literature, the monographs and so forth, but we have also had mention of annual reports and this type of thing. I'm sure the library school librarians feel that some identification of what libraries have produced, what annual reports, when, would be of value. But can we be this inclusive? Are we speaking of complete inclusiveness when we speak of current awareness? How much needs to be brought to our awareness? And we have the peripheral areas, too, inclusive for other disciplines that relate to librarianship. This is a big kettle we're talking about. What's essential? What could we survive with? What would be the limits? How far do we want to extend such current awareness?

Shera

One of the important elements in this is that so many of these things, especially now when the government's getting into this area, are published in relatively limited supply, research reports and this kind of thing. If you don't have a fairly prompt reporting, you may not be able to get the document. And I wonder, Wes, if you couldn't say something about ERIC, because it seems to me this is an area where ERIC could be tremendously important.

Simonton

I'll be talking about many of these things as I react this afternoon. But I would underscore what Jesse has just said. I think that the primary function of a current awareness service should be to bring to our attention the things that we otherwise wouldn't know about. If we know that certain journals are going to be indexed in Library Literature, or they're going to be covered in Documentation Abstracts, or some other source, then our need is not so great, it seems to me, as it is for the fugitive material which Jesse has just mentioned. And certainly ERIC will have a primary responsibility for securing, identifying, listing, the fugitive material. Now, a good bit of this will be done through the monthly bibliography, Research in Education.

Shera

Maybe the Wilson Company should be moved back to Minneapolis.

Harris

I think first we might try to define current awareness. How prompt is a current awareness service, for instance?

Does this mean we're going to be informed about developments in a week, two weeks, or two months, three months, four months? I think this would make a great deal of difference.

In library history right now, I have a current awareness service through my personal contacts with my colleagues in this area--and much faster, I think, than you could ever get it through any SDI project. And I have my doubts about what we really mean by current awareness. We are disturbed, of course, by a year or two year lag, but on the other hand how prompt a notice do we need on these developments?

Stevens

Well, let us assume it would be monthly. That is a fairly reasonable time lag. I would like to inquire, what is the value of your finding out about material so rapidly?

Harris

Well, the greatest value, of course, to me is to avoid a duplication of research, and I think this is basically what most of us are concerned with. Library school librarians, of course, want to acquire things, and be aware of them. But from the point of view of someone that's doing the research in a certain field, and is a reader of this type of research, the great benefit to me is that, first, I know where it's happened and what's going on, and secondly I don't tend to duplicate these things, which has been a real problem in library history, as you know. So this is the greatest benefit to me, being able to avoid duplicating other research.

Lazorick

I'd like to comment. I'm going to generalize this to scientists, because I'm not sure specifically how it applies to librarians.

I don't think the scientists really worry about duplicating research. You know, this isn't their concern. Their employers worry about it because of economic considerations. But I think the scientist researcher--a chemist, let's say--is a chemist because it's fun to get into the laboratory and do experiments. He really doesn't care what's published. Now, in terms of his own experiments, he may care because what he reads may generate ideas so that he can get back into the laboratory and fiddle. But in terms of actually duplicating someone else's research, I don't think he worries about it. And this may be true of librarians.

Stevens

With the scarcity of research in library science, I presume that the possibilities of anyone's duplicating a project were about the same as being struck by lightning. But I may be wrong on that.

Lazorick

I disagree, and I think we see it in the library automation area. How many acquisition systems are being designed right now, for example? And in other areas of librarianship? How many use studies have been done of libraries? Everyone wants to do his own.

Harris

This applies to every area. We now have four masters theses that have been written on the life of Ainsworth Rand Spofford. The first one, written in 1933, was by far the best; and the other three, frankly, although they make some contribution, probably could have devoted their time to some other subject.

Atherton

I figuratively, and now verbally, will attack Mr. Lazorick for his comments about scientists not being worried about duplicating anybody else's efforts. Why do you think they go to meetings and stand out in the hall to talk to their colleagues? It's to find out what they're doing. They're not going to find out if they're duplicating someone's research from literature that's a year old or two years old. They'll only find out in a contemporary situation. There is no backlog of information from the past to tell them this. It's an extremely important concern of the scientist who has a feeling that he is building on the shoulders of giants and that he is contributing something. He's very concerned about whether he's duplicating or not. And they spend a lot of time discussing details down to how many test tubes they use, to see if the methodology they're using is different enough even if the problem is the same, so that they can compare results later. Now, an administrator might call that duplication, but a scientist wouldn't because he knows he's collecting data in a slightly different environment. Now, maybe you call that rationalization. I don't happen to--having worked with nuclear physicists especially. It's a pretty expensive operation, and they're concerned about it.

But, now, current awareness for our own field. Here again I have to say, who are the users of the current awareness service? You've heard from a few research workers here in our field. We have one kind of need, and it is being met primarily by our informal communication patterns just as it is in science. But what about the teachers who aren't doing research and have to keep up-to-date in order to give their students current information in their lectures? That's a different kind of awareness problem. The administrator who has got to say whether or not he's going to let his staff develop a new automated acquisition system has another kind of problem. He has to find out if somebody else, indeed, has a computer-based system, using the same equipment that will give them the acquisition system they want without the start-up time.

So you have to identify the user before you can answer questions about current awareness service. In physics we limited ourselves to the research physicists. At first we didn't worry about the teachers. We didn't worry about the political physicists as we called them. We worried instead about the research workers. We found that their needs might conceivably be quite different from the others, but they were a recognizable audience, and we tailor-made some of our current awareness services after their expressed needs.

Stevens

Mrs. Atherton has just answered another question that was passed to us from the auditors--answered it very well--that there are several library professions with different needs. Nevertheless, when we speak of current awareness, we speak of one service. Is it impossible for one service in library science to meet all needs? Are the needs there? We shouldn't ask first, is it possible to meet them?, but, are the needs all there for current awareness? Do acquisitions librarians need them? Do researchers need them? And for other people, is the time lag that an annual review provides a serious time lag?

Batty

The problem of who uses a service like this and the nature of the current awareness service seems to me to involve the nature of ignorance. We were talking last night over dinner about the categories of ignorance, and I think this is involved here, because the other kinds of service which might be thought of as providing awareness but which are conventionally struck in different directions, like an indexing service or an abstracting service, are really directed towards those people who know something already. Whereas what Pauline Atherton has just been talking about is that category of user who does not know.

Now, how can you find out about something, the nature of which you do not yet know? It's in that vast emptiness of ignorance. If you can ask a question intelligently enough, you have already provided yourself with most of the answer. The current awareness service is for those people who do not even know that they don't know yet. This means that we have this as one end of a range, a possible range, of services. And it may be that, logically, the current awareness service, because of its need to be current and rapidly produced, is the kind of service that spreads itself, as it were, thinly over a very large area and, therefore, can bring in a great deal of stuff which would not normally be thought of (even by those people who do know something already when they're looking for answers to questions) and in this way supply something of that need to provide guides through this jungle of ignorance, or whatever kind of analogy you want to use.

Corrigan

I want to support what Dave just said. I see a current awareness service as being a method of compelling a kind of change in a practical library situation, not in library research, not in necessarily the teaching of librarianship, but in the working situation in libraries, by forcing people to be aware of what is going on. So that they cannot construct services, construct buildings, do anything, and claim, "Well, I didn't know this was going on," "I didn't realize that anybody else had tested this before," or whatever it is. And for those of the profession that are interested anyway, the current awareness service should enable them to keep up to date in the areas they're interested in and in areas peripheral to their main interest.

Shera

I can summarize a little bit of this, although it is probably more a summary of me than a summary of discussion. We talked here just in the last few minutes about the user and his needs and so on. It seems to me that here we are up against a problem of social structure, which holds in any profession. You can view it, I think, as a kind of series of concentric circles. You have at the center a little hard group--hard core--of people who are really at the focus of this thing. They have their own information system. Mr. Harris has mentioned he has his friends out bringing things to his attention. They talk to each other. They meet at meetings. My next door neighbor, for example, happens to be a leading othopedist. He's president this year of the American Orthopedic Association. Well, now, when he wants to know what's going on in bone research, I'm sure he knows exactly the people who can tell him. He doesn't use any kind of fancy state-of-the-art business in orthopedics or anything like that.

Outside that circle you have another group that's sort of pushing in. They want to get in on this, and they need a different kind of service that will help them get into the in-group. This is the old business of social mobility, you see. And beyond that you have another circle and so on. And finally you get out to the student, and here we're up against what Pat Knapp was talking about in her paper--the need of the student to get a comprehensive view of not only librarianship, but of the problems related to it and of the disciplines on which librarianship is based.

I don't think there is any one service that is going to meet the needs of all these people. The inner core are pretty well satisfied with what they have. I've always said that what they needed was something that brought them up to date on what was going on in peripheral areas. But Pauline has kind of shaken my faith in this now--when I find out that they can't interpret what's going on from the state-of-the-art presentations.

It's a very complex thing we're dealing with here, and I would be astonished if we can come up with any real, hard, solid recommendations, because it is so complex. We talk about the best things. Well, best for whom? Best for what? Maybe you want to look at junk, because you're interested in junk. You're interested in where people went off the sled in particular areas and so you want to study that.

Back in this 1950 Unesco conference that I mentioned, D. J. Urquhart said a little aphorism I thought was very good. He said, the problem of bibliography--the basic problem of bibliography--is how little to read. I think that's a very nice statement. It's a real problem. And I think once you state it you see how difficult the problem is. Our needs are so complex, so extensive.

I would hope that this thing would be followed up by a smaller conference. It would bring together people like the Wilson Company and ERIC and the information science people and the British people and say: all right, here we are. How do we integrate? How do we relate to each other? We've gotten a kind of general idea from this conference of what the field wants. Let's settle down now and work out a plan in which ERIC will do so and so, and Library Literature will do something else, and so on.

The problem is so complex and so vast. I hope this is not the counsel of despair. I don't mean it to be. I think our first move is to start from the services we've already got, rather than to worry about new services. Strengthen those. Help them to expand perhaps in areas where expansion is needed. When you come right down to it--to the shoemaker's children being barefoot--we aren't really. I'm sure we're in better shape than some of the other disciplines, with things like ERIC and Library Lit and so on.

I think what we need here is coordination, integration, refinement--in the light of the best guidance we can give 'em. And I'm afraid the best guidance we can give 'em isn't as good, certainly isn't as good as I wish it were. Well, I don't know if that's much of a summary.

Stevens

Thank you. I must say I think this meeting is coordinated, integrated, and refined. This morning we have had reactions from a selected group, comments, and ideas toward what is needed. This afternoon we will hope to see how it can be produced, and then Saturday morning everyone will have a chance to make more specific demands and recommendations, on the coordinated, integrated services that are represented here.

And now for lunch.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, April 19th: 1:00 PM. David Batty, Moderator

Lawson

This afternoon we are discussing papers covering bibliographic organization, services, and techniques. David Batty will be the moderator.

Batty

Thank you Venable. This morning we had a discussion, and I think a very useful investigation, of a number of the points that seem essential in providing a context for any forward movement in discussing the provision of services in the area that we're all concerned with. These are the problems of the nature and extent of the field of library science itself, and of the identity of the user of library science literature and his needs--whether he needs a current awareness service, abstract bulletins, or review services of one kind or another.

This afternoon we're going to be concerned with the ways in which we can provide these services. The reactors this afternoon are Joe Becker on my left and Wes Simonton on my right.

Simonton

As I indicated earlier this morning, I feel that I am here both officially and unofficially--officially as a Director of the ERIC Clearing House for Library and Information Sciences, and unofficially as a concerned user of library literature. I shall try to distinguish as I talk, things which I can say officially and those things which I cannot say officially. I think perhaps I should say a little bit about ERIC, although most of you know about it.

I would remind you that our Clearing House is one of eighteen, most of the others being more strictly within the field of education, so that we have interests which are perhaps a little different from many of the others. The three major functions of ERIC Clearing Houses are to acquire fugitive literature (the literature which is not well controlled bibliographically), to index and to abstract that literature, and to repackage or to provide a certain amount of information and analysis. The clearing houses occupy a place between the researcher and the practitioner. They analyze the results of research in education and make it available to a wide audience. The degree of emphasis among these three functions is not firmly established and, indeed, varies between the clearing houses.

At the moment, our clearing house is one of the newest and we are in the position of establishing our policies and procedures. This conference comes at a very good time for us. We have to keep in mind the three things we are supposed to do, but we look to this conference for relative emphasis. We may or may not be able to accept the recommendations that come out of this conference in terms of our commitment to the central program of ERIC, but we do look here for guidance.

The title of our conference is the Bibliographical Control of Library Science Literature, but several of the papers refer also to the information sciences. We have a problem of defining what is our core and what is our fringe. We have been talking this morning without really defining the field. Are we concerned with the information sciences as well as with library science?

As I look at the materials to be controlled, I see certain problems. First of all, identification of the core and the fringe in terms of subject and in terms of importance. We've been talking about books, I think, primarily this morning, with casual references to reports and pamphlets, and other fugitive materials. I think we have already said enough about annual reviews, but I would underscore what, I guess, Pauline Atherton was saying, that most annual reviews are going to be dependent on individual interest. We have the ARIST (Annual Review of Information Science and Technology) because of Cuadra. We have Mike

Harris working on Library History. At least at this point, annual reviews seem to be dependent on individuals.

I want to say a little bit about journal literature, particularly with regard to ERIC. ERIC as a system has been going for almost two years now. Some of the clearing houses are almost two years old in terms of their federal funding. Up to this point, they have not been concerned with the journal literature. Many of them have wanted to take account of it, but primarily the emphasis has been on the report literature, the conference proceedings, the speeches, the sort of thing that doesn't get controlled. But at the moment, ERIC is generally starting to think about controlling the journal literature. We have really no hint yet as to what we want to do or what we should do in controlling the journal literature. All I can say, is that evidently we will soon be taking account of it.

We also haven't said much yet about whether we are concerned with the foreign literature (non-English language) and whether that should be indexed and/or abstracted. These of course are points to which Mr. Corrigan in particular addresses himself.

We have talked about the problems of identification and acquisition of materials. We've been talking about current awareness; we've been talking about a selective listing. We've already raised some questions this morning about what a current awareness service is. But we haven't really addressed ourselves to the question of do we really want a comprehensive listing of all the documents that might be part of that system? We see so many references in our literature to the weakness of our literature, to the repetitive quality of much of it. Do we want all state library association bulletins indexed, for example? Do we want all journals indexed? I think we need to do some hard thinking about this. If we are to have some kind of a selective listing as Dr. Osborn has proposed, we need to have some hard thinking about who is going to do the selecting.

ERIC, has, as one of its objectives, the evaluation of fugitive materials in particular. From some points of view, it might be feasible to assign responsibility to ERIC. Whether it is a feasible thought to assign it to the library schools and to be ultimately dependent on a cooperative arrangement, with the problems involved therein, may be something we should talk about. If we do assign responsibility for selection to a single agency, or to a group of agencies, obviously we have to be willing to live with that and, at least for a while, to accept the criteria and the decisions made by such an agency.

I think it's very important to first think about the clientele to be served. Most of us are here because we are in library schools. We emphasize, or we see, the needs of library school faculty and library school students. But we were already beginning to talk a little bit this morning about the practitioner and whether the practitioner needs something quite different from the researcher and even from the student. So I think we have varying needs in terms of depths, in terms of coverage of foreign literature, and in terms of urgency.

There are many instances in which we do have different audiences. Different audiences who want different things from perhaps a single body of literature. The American Library Association has certain needs, the Special Library Association has other needs, the American Society for Information Science has other needs, and we cannot ignore them. We must try to take them into account, and to disseminate our bibliographical record and other services through the professional associations. For example, I am very hopeful that ERIC will be able to use some of the journals of the American Library Association for the dissemination of abstracts, or for the dissemination of bibliographies.

Obviously we must decide on the form our bibliographic control is to take, and the most obvious decision is whether we are going to have a classified approach or some sort of alphabetical approach. A number of papers for this conference speak to some of the problems in Library Literature; and it is, of course, very easy to find things in Library Literature, find methods of organization, that we do not like. Obviously we cannot have direct alphabetical subject headings and still retain a classified approach. But do we want both? And if so, how will this affect the structure of our bibliographic organization? And then there is the matter of hardware and technology--the problems of machinery that will format.

As Mr. Corrigan has pointed out in his paper, it has been easier to obtain funds for bibliographic activities (at least for an annual review) in the information sciences than in library science. Whether this is because we have not been as aggressive in library science, per se, may be something for discussion.

I think this is all I want to do at this point. All I've done is pose some questions, but they seem to me to be the basic questions that we have to come to grips with. I would second what Jesse Shera said this morning. It is a little difficult for a group such as this to take any effective action, but I do not think that that means that a group such as this should not present some recommendations or give some serious thought to what should be done. Any recommendations that come out of the group would then have to be considered in the light of some of the other users whom I've hinted at, and some of the other needs of the profession.

Batty

Thank you, Wesley. The next reactor for this session is Joseph Becker.

Becker

Well, I've never been a reactor before, and when I was dubbed one, I expected an atomic pile of papers, and sure enough that's what arrived at the house. My job for this afternoon is to review the papers by Ted Hines, Andy Osborn, and Philip Corrigan. I'd like to do that one at a time and then try to summarize, the way Wes did, just what the main points are that lie before us for consideration.

Ted has done the yeoman's work here in outlining for us what the pros and cons are of the different classification techniques. He's done this for conventional systems; he's done it for unconventional systems, like citation indexing which has been used in the field of chemistry. He then postulates in his paper an ideal index, and provides for us, I think, the criteria that we can use for judging which of these techniques, or which combination of them, would actually satisfy our purpose best. Ted's paper is going to be extremely important to us in terms of serving as a foundation on which to build the decisions that we'll have to make with respect to classification and organization.

Andy Osborn has really concentrated or focused on things that exist today. For example, he looked at the structure of Library Literature, its format, its display, the kinds of materials which it covers, and he notes and observes that the headings used in Library Literature are too broad for his purposes. He feels that they should be made far more precise and that some consideration should be given to this. Essentially he addresses himself to modification of an existing tool, and he doesn't consider the question of a major overhaul. But this is the area to which Philip Corrigan, on the other hand, did address himself.

I found this paper extremely interesting reading, particularly Philip, when I gather you did this from your hospital bed, which is all the more to warrent congratulations. He was out with a broken leg, he told me last night, and through the help and assistance of his good wife, he managed to communicate with the literature sufficiently to put out what I consider to be a very thorough-going job in terms of what we need in order to get on with the bibliographic organization of library science materials.

First, Philip defines library science, which no author in the group that I examined attempted to do. He broadened the traditional definition of library science and embraced the field of documentation and the field of information science. I thought his definition excluded what I would call non-numerical data processing, that is, linguistics and the use of the computer for handling language. We'll hear more from him later on that.

He makes some practical suggestions on how to go about getting fast access. For example, he estimates that there are about ten thousand items a year that would fall in this category. Mike [Harris] asked this morning how many we were talking about. Here is an estimate on Philip's part, which I imagine he can describe and indicate to you how he arrived at it, of ten thousand items, and he suggests that for such items we consider fortnightly--that's his word, not mine--review, so that there would be about four hundred items per issue. He looks upon this as a signaling device, not something to consult to see if someone is doing research, but just to alert us to what's going on in the different areas of our interests, whether they be core or fringe. He feels that it should be international in scope so that it will contain material that would concentrate on the world rather than on any one country. Materials for current awareness should be at least within a six month period. If it's older than six months, Philip doesn't consider it a candidate for inclusion in a current awareness tool. He then feels that there should be some very fast way of distributing this tool.

So in summarizing his paper, and Andy's and Ted's, and the kinds of comments that Wes made before, I think the job before us today is (1) to define the field, (2) to define the user community and its needs, (3) to define the size and form of coverage, and then (4) to recommend the services. Will they be a trio, or should we have a quartet, and add an annual review, for example?

Once we define those things, the field, the user community and needs, the size and form of coverage, and recommend the ideal characteristics of the services we want, then it seems to me, we have to make a decision: do we build from scratch in order to achieve what we want? It's a question of whether we integrate and coordinate, as was suggested this morning, or whether we centralize and create anew. And finally it's a question of identifying the methodology, and I simply volunteer three or four considerations here.

It's going to take a great deal of organization of human talent to pull this off, much the way the library community has mobilized itself in the past for some important undertakings. It's a people problem to begin with, to be sure that we're all pulling together and that we're all properly motivated. Secondly, I see the computer as playing an important role here, because as a machine type I recognize the value of machine-readable information and the many by-products that can be derived from it in time. And then finally, photography. We've mentioned microfiche this morning. In a few of the systems where they have had expanded computer-driven bibliographic sources, like MEDLARS for example, they always stumble over the problem of getting at the data, to get at the original article, and if our universe of information is small enough, then I favor the notion of having a microfiche collection of the materials which are recorded in our comprehensive record.

Well, that constitutes the basis of my remarks, Mr. Moderator.

Batty

Thank you. The papers, I think, agree on a number of points, as Joseph pointed out, and I'd like to mention one or two of them and indicate the direction that our discussion might take.

Library science, as many of the people who wrote papers in this session have mentioned, is a soft area, with a soft terminology, a shifting terminology. And one or two of them, if I remember rightly, suggested that this has been the reason why, or it may have been the reason why, we don't have the kind of services that we think we ought to have, and parallels have been drawn with other fields. My opinion on this, and I offer it for what it is worth, is that the softer the area, the harder should be the control over it.

Another point which everyone has made is that we are very much aware that the services we now enjoy, are insufficient, by the very highest standards and ideals of our own profession, and we'd like to improve them, though they have done very well within their own limitations in the past.

A third point that has arisen is the number of services that may be contemplated. One of the points that came to my mind, time after time this morning, was that quite often we are tempted into the administrator's position of trying to get one thing to do all the jobs that we see in front of us. Administrators, it seems to me, by nature are panacea seekers; life isn't that simple. Most of the papers, too, agree that we need new or revised services to do the kind of thing we want to see done.

Now, it seems to me that the discussion that goes on this afternoon should center on the attitudes and the opinions that the papers in this session have brought out. They concern services in two ways. They discuss them as channels of information, that is, what services we are concerned with; and secondly they discuss the intellectual organization of those services, whatever they may be.

I have a ground rule as well, just as Jane Stevens did this morning. I will cut off anybody who gets into too detailed a discussion of general indexing theory. Tempting though it is, I think it's going to take valuable time away from what we should otherwise concern ourselves with.

Osborn

One thing in urging comprehensiveness, is that somehow in our own field we seem to apply different canons to those we apply in other fields of knowledge. In 1942, the Farmington Plan indicated a sense of national responsibility to see that the kind of omissions that caused difficulty at that time would never occur again. They were greatly concerned, for example, that material about Japan wasn't brought into the United States. This is the kind of thing that concerns me now in our own professional literature, that we may be making a serious omission in not covering Russian, Chinese, and other sources of information. In the spirit of the Farmington Plan, we should be responsible for covering the world literature on the subject.

I remember how Dr. Bishop in the 1930's used to speak of the way the world clearly recognized that the United States led without question in two disciplines. One was astronomy, because of the use of photographic methods; the other was library science. I keep wondering the extent to which the United States leads in library science now. I'm very much impressed with the rise of British writings on library science in the past few years. There is extremely important material from Russia, and from other countries. From a teaching or professional viewpoint, the writings from other countries serve to give an objective point of view about what we are doing. This is an area in which I think that cooperative work is possible, that one or another of us could be responsible for supplying information of what's happening on the Chinese mainland, what's happening in Soviet Russia, and so on.

I think there's another factor that comes in historically too. That is, despite the fact that we're one of the oldest scholarly professions, we seem to be coming to maturity only in recent years. You can tell, for example, in the increasing, steadily increasing, maturity of our graduate studies in library schools. I think Library Literature, for example, served our earlier library school programs much better than it serves our more advanced programs today. In my paper I emphasize the matter of description, because we are a profession which from the time Callimachus on, for a thousand years, has dedicated itself to the art of description. We shouldn't lose sight of the fact that this is one of our special responsibilities.

I feel that value judgements must come into a literature which is growing extremely rapidly in extent, or we may handicap our research work still more. I think we ought to read into this conference the famous opening remark that Bill Katz used in the Drexel Library Quarterly account of our professional literature.[7] I wish I had the string of adjectives at hand that Bill used, and at lunch time I asked him if he could remember the adjectives he used to damn our professional literature, but rather than be made to remember them, he slipped quietly from the meeting. This is something that is very true. There is so much material in our professional field that is not worth the cost of indexing or abstracting. And so we are concerned with value judgements in the face of sheer quantity.

---

[7] Bill Katz, "Publications," Drexel Library Quarterly, 5:176-84, April 1967.

We are staying away from indexing theory to quite an extent, but historically again there is one very important thing to say. The great lesson that Mort Taube taught us is that for a long, long period of time we could operate efficiently with the logic of classes. But with research needs coming to the fore from World War II on, we add to the logic of classes a need for a propositional logic.

And, Pauline [Atherton], if you'll forgive me, this is one step which I wish that you and Phyllis had gone on to in your analysis of classification schemes. I wish that you'd gone on to a propositional function, or a relational function; because I think this is one of the great problems of research--the logic of classes. We need not only classes and sub-classes, the traditional kind of classification, but also a propositional logic that will give us control of quite complex situations. And this is where, I feel, we are moving steadily over to the computer. The computer can handle the propositional logic so simply.

Batty

Perhaps I can directly cut in here and ask Pauline if she'll respond to that point. I was going to ask her if she would like to relate her very elegant structure for investigation of the nature of schemes to the kind of thing that we're concerned with this afternoon.

Atherton

I wish Phyllis [Richmond] were here because she is the brains behind this, and I am the brawn. We pulled together examples of the use of classification and tried to identify what a classification should do, what its purpose should be. In relying on printed examples we couldn't show the immediate relationship between the classes and their use for printing in linear array. There have been some imaginative things done in trying to show poetry or drama as going on on several levels and still have it on the same page. Printed music does this best--much better than we can so far. That is why I think we're so oriented in our paper to what you'd call non-faceted schemes, and why we barely touched on the relational functions that Phyllis and I would think are much more important than any of the schemes that we've described. I can only give this excuse; I can't say it is a reason.

I was hoping to be able to comment on why no one made any comments on our paper. The two reactors ignored it, so I'm glad that we're starting to talk a little about it.

Batty

Could I move, in fact, to ask Ted Hines if he would make a point in the same area on the subject that his own paper covers. He dealt with alphabetical indexing, or rather he dealt with a lot of kinds of indexing, but he moved towards an assumption that a very useful kind was very simple alphabetical indexing. How far in this field, Ted, do you feel that we need a structure of classes to organize the kind of terminology and language that we will be concerned with in these bibliographical control services, and how far can we rely on natural language systems of the kind that you described?

Hines

You sort of asked me the wrong question, and I would like to temporize.

Batty

Why don't you ask yourself the right question and then answer it?

Hines

The reason that I would like to temporize is that I wonder whether the point for discussion of this particular issue really arises at this juncture in time, and the little thing that I had written down when you called on me was geared around the fact that I've heard nobody mention here something which I think we're all taking for granted. And that is that, proportionately speaking, our control of our literature is not as good as it was in 1938.

There are, as far as I can tell, a significant number of good abstracting services where the scope is limited by lack of funds or something else. But we have only one really good indexing service...

[Omission: At this point both the audiotape and the stenotype recording systems broke down, and there is no record of the next few minutes. The highlight of the missing section was--in the editor's memory--a comment by Ted Hines on the seeming ingratitude but honest necessity at times of criticizing the actions of one's own mother or, even, of the H. W. Wilson Company. One report of the Conference (Library Journal, 93:2215, June 1, 1968) printed a portion of Hines' remarks:

> "Wilson feels--with many librarians--that the technical report is not here to stay and is somehow obscene," observed Hines. "Wilson ought to be doing something about new technology. Please--can't we even get the same level of coverage we had in 1938? I blow my stack every time I consult Library Literature...I don't like to ask for federal money or CLR grants for new ideas before we first light a fire under my mother."

From this point on there were frequent allusions to "Ted Hines' mother."]

Herling

I would like to say that I don't think we have yet defined the field that we're talking about. I think that I would prefer that Dr. Shera define it rather than I.

I would say that I think that librarians today in particular, perhaps more than any other time in history, have to make all knowledge, wherever it may be, whatever field, their province, if it contributes to good library service. And all the fields that I am talking about would include mass communications, both the theory and the practice, the behavioral sciences, computer technology. That's the few that I can name. I think that Dr. Shera can probably add some more.

I would prefer to let Mr. Lazorick speak about current awareness service as a technique because that's his speciality. He is running an operational SDI system in Buffalo with a great deal of success. Before I let him talk, though, I would say that I am a participant in that SDI system, with a profile that I did in too great a hurry. Mine was designed to pick up information in the fields of information science, scientific information, and library science. Now, the results of that have been to provide me with so many references that I am unable to read them all, but they do come from sources other than the usual library literature. I leave aside the fact that the data base does include the Clearinghouse [for Federal Scientific and Technical Information] reports, and a large number of most interesting documents are picked up from that source, partly because the report titles are enriched with descriptors. In addition I pick up articles from journals like Food Engineering, The American Journal of Rentronology, and a variety of scientific journals that would never be indexed by Library Literature. I think that if my profile had been more carefully designed, I would have gotten more. If you do have an available machine-readable data base, you can search for articles in the field outside of what we normally consider as library science. I don't know, it seems to me the definition commonly accepted here is a rather narrow one.

Lazorick

The kind of service we propose is imperfect. But it can be an input which serves, if nothing else, the function of identifying things which should be considered for other indexing services or for state-of-the-art reviews or annual cumulations.

I'm going to comment now about current awareness in general and my feelings on it. I personally think that current awareness is needed. I think that every practicing scientist in the world should have a current awareness service. I don't feel that current awareness services are wanted. I don't think that the run-of-the-mill scientist or librarian would want a current awareness service. I don't think a current awareness service will be accepted for a few reasons.

For one thing, I believe a current awareness service will provide more information than the scientist normally gets. Scientists don't have time now to cope with the information that does come across their desks. As a result of this they'll turn against the system which is feeding them. What it comes down to is: is it better not to know and don't know you don't know, or is it better not to know and know you don't know? I think that the real test of a current awareness service will be what someone is willing to pay for it, and although everyone says that they would like to have a current awareness service, when it comes down to cold, hard cash, I don't think people will pay for it, at least not on their own. Their boss maybe, their employer; but they won't.

This morning, I believe Mr. Harris talked about time. What do you mean by current awareness services in terms of time? I don't think that any current awareness service which relies on human indexing could ever be current. Therefore, I think that in some way we have to accept the limitations of automatic indexing as they exist today.

One other point that's been made all day is, I think that everyone here is talking about information scientists and library scientists as though they're separate things; I think of library science as a sub-set of information science. Library science should be included under the information science umbrella.

Batty

I feel as you do about the distinction between library and information science, but not quite, because to me information science is part of library science. I think too often they are seen as different and yet they're not. They're handling information, disseminating it, passing it on; it may be to a different clientele; it may be in different circumstances.

You've made an interesting point, now I'd like to throw out a somewhat outrageous comment. Quite simply, that everybody is bone idle. Everybody is lazy. Nobody wants to read anything. Nobody wants to do any work. Scientists claim that they haven't time to read their literature, but how much time do they spend staring out of the window or at the lab bench, or how many times do they do unnecessary little jobs when they could be reading literature?

We as librarians are even worse; that is we're just as bad about not reading the literature. We're just as lazy as everybody else, but we ought to know better.

It seems to me, then, that we could say that current awareness service is essential. But we have to prove that it is essential. Therefore, we should tie everyone down and beat them over the head with it. But is this going too far?

Atherton

We have two things mixed here; and I can see why they're mixed because they're both of great interest to us. And that is (1) the current awareness problem and (2) the true bibliographic control problem which requires comprehensive or retrospective searching.

We tried to isolate these two things in doing user requirement studies at the American Institute of Physics. We weren't too successful in approaching it from the point of view of profiles, because a man is currently interested in what's available now as well as what's available that's ten or fifteen years old.

The way you react to a current awareness service is going to be different, depending on whether you want to have a service that allows you to browse at your leisure so that you can use it instead of staring out of a window or whether you want to find out something that's absolutely current because you need it right this minute to write the last footnote references for your article on your research project, or you need to know if anybody is duplicating what you're now writing a proposal for, or beginning to teach a class in. So that it's a function of your activity at a given time as to how you're going to react to a current awareness service, I think, as well as to any retrospective service.

We've talked about there not being enough indexers at the H. W. Wilson Company to do the job, and we're probably going to have a cooperative effort among the library schools to get the indexing done à la Farmington Plan. This immediately means that people who are going to use these services have got to be involved in the creation of these services. And as I understand it, this is what kept *Library Literature* alive with abstracts in the thirties. It was the Junior Members Roundtable of ALA, I believe, with Lucile Morsch and a few others that really kept this going when it looked like it was going under for a while. I don't know the full history of it, but I'm saying it looks like we need the same kind of grass roots participation.

I'd like to report at this time an experiment that I just tried this semester at Syracuse in the Library School. The two students who are writing the final reports on the class project call it a human-based SDI system. These students not only searched the literature for the entire class against the class's profile for their term projects, but they also received the notices for their individual research projects. They were both the originators of the notices as well as the receivers of the notices from other people in the class. We started with interest profiles in free language, and because it was a six page list, they were very resistant to having to do this kind of work for other people. But when the vocabulary was trimmed down, and they began to get notices of things that they probably could not have pulled out very easily in their own literature searches during one semester, they began to react a little differently to the service.

Now, whether these students will be the first volunteers to help in an international library science abstracts cooperative effort or not, I don't know. But they have a new awareness of what's involved in creating such a service, as well as what benefit it's going to be to them in doing their own term projects.

Whatley

I'd like to make three points in connection with the previous remarks. One is that I agree with what Ted Hines has said and also Philip Corrigan with regards to trying to do something with the existing services. Perhaps one of the things which might come out of this conference is to urge upon the Wilson Company that they should perhaps revise their practices in line with some of the suggestions that have been made this afternoon.

The second thing is that I could report that British librarians are very keenly interested in doing something to improve Library Science Abstracts at the moment and we have been examining the position for the last two years. At the meeting I attended last month, the decision on what developments should take place was delayed because I wished to report to the meeting the decisions made at this conference this weekend. Our tentative proposals are that Library Science Abstracts could be enlarged to become a six times a year publication and that the format should be changed considerably to meet modern ideas of what you want in an abstracting service.

And thirdly, one more point I'd like to make is this, that I'm very doubtful indeed whether the different kinds of services which have been suggested today can be produced voluntarily or semi-voluntarily. If we turn to the socialist block countries we see that it's obviously a nationally organized production unit which produces, say, VINITI or, in Hungary, produces the Express Information Service.

Shera

I'd like to correct, if I may, one statement that Pauline made about the Morsch thing. I happen to be somewhat older than Pauline. I lived through this. In the 1930's the Junior Members were looking around for something to do. They were very much disgruntled because they couldn't break into this inner circle. We've got these concentric circles that I talked about this morning. And what did they do? One of the things that seemed most essential was to bring Cannons up to date. And so the Junior Members decided that's what they would do and Lucile Morsch was put in charge of it. And then the Wilson Company picked it up from there because it did seem to be valuable. So that the Junior Members didn't save a faltering thing, they actually started a new one.

But I certainly want to support what Allan said about this volunteer business, because you simply cannot run a service like this on a volunteer basis. Old William Frederick Poole went over that road and it didn't work; and it's going to work, I think, even less today. I too am quite concerned about Ted's mother. I think she ought to have all the help she can get, poor dear, and I have said, with all due apologies to Wes Simonton, why on earth did they start an ERIC in library literature? Why didn't they give the federal money to the Wilson Company and expand what they had rather than set up another agency?

I get worried when we over-define these things. We've been talking about needs. The users can't tell us what their needs are. You can't tell yourself what your needs are. So go ahead, I think, and use as much common sense as you can on ad hoc procedures, and develop it from there. We spend a lot of time in "research" trying to measure user needs, but I've never yet seen a use study that I thought amounted to a hill of beans. Case Institute of Technology got a big chunk of money back in the fifties to study the way scientists use literature. They put stopwatches on the wrists of the scientists, and they were to make records every fifteen minutes, and write diaries as to what they did. The only thing of any importance that came out of it was they found that scientists did more talking than listening. Use studies always sort of fall apart. I think that if we just try not to get so damned scientific about all of this, and go ahead and put all of the resources we can into it and build on what we've got, we'll be much better off than if we try to develop a very ornate and fancy scheme. We'll get results a lot quicker, I'm sure.

Atherton

Now I have to correct Jesse. The Case study that you mentioned did not put stopwatches on the scientists. They used a random alarm device which is still being used currently for study of medical research workers. It was a good technique to get data easily from the scientist without his having to keep a diary, without his having to recall, and therefore not trust, his memory. It has proven to be very useful and is not much of a burden to the scientist. And some of the things they found out did have ramifications in the study of the use of literature and the design of services, for the American Chemical Society especially.

It bothers me when you take an ad hoc approach to something. I'm a seat-of-the-pants type librarian. I trust my intuition to do the right thing; but if I find out it's wrong, I want to change. We don't take enough time to get negative results or to build the possibility for change into what we design. There are plenty of examples around the national laboratories we could draw on. When they started mechanizing their acquisitions lists, they made them look like acquisitions lists instead of categorizing them so that the individual departments could scan them more easily. Well, they could correct their basic design when they started distributing this widely, because it was in machine-readable form and very adaptable. But if you use the Mother's Invention rather than use a newer invention (to stay with Ted's analogy) you're almost fixed in concrete. It isn't as easy to change as it may need to be. But with a user requirement study, and with a flexible format, you can modify the service you're trying to present to the user as you get more data from him on a continuing basis over a year or two years.

Osborn

I think that first class results can come from cooperative indexing. There's a relatively new publication called Canadian Slavic Studies. And one of my faculty was asked to list for that new Russian reference books, and this he did so successfully that Canadian Slavic Studies then asked if he would take over the responsibility for indexing all the Russian bibliographical entries. He came to me to ask if this was something that should be done. I said, yes, this was a very fine service for a library school, and that we would provide the staff and the money so it could be done.

I think this is a very practical possibility that really could make a difference to the indexing of our professional literature if another school went on to take the responsibility for China, for Japan, and so on. It would make a vast difference from what we are able to do now.

Batty

A problem arises there. What happens when a well-meaning volunteer decides that he can no longer cope with the work? Is there always another well-meaning volunteer to come along and do it after him with the same standards?

Osborn

What I said was that the school was ready to supply the supporting staff and money, so it would be possible for him to continue the program. I think at schools we really could support such an undertaking very profitably. The fact that he was listing and indexing Russian reference books was a tremendous asset because this meant that he brought all the items into the university. There is this side to it, that you benefit tremendously locally from accepting the responsibilities for such a service.

Hines

In my own institution, the libraries have been in the past couple of months the recipients of some three million bucks for investigating automation activities in connection with libraries. This is only a small dollop of all the money which has gone into information science in various ways in the past few years. If information science is supposed to be the area that's going to help other people control their literature, it would seem to me that one of the most profitable investments that could conceivably be made of government, or other funds, would be to control the literature of this field sufficiently to help the practitioners who are engaging in the automation. I, myself, know of at least two institutions, speaking of the flexibility of material in machine-readable form, that threw away very large dollops of material in machine-readable form, because their original study hadn't been thorough enough to provide the means for reformating it. It is true that with good designs you could do a lot. I think that both Dr. Shera and I would urge the Wilson Company to put every effort into applying new technology productively to what they're doing.

It is certainly true that we need a current awareness service, but I haven't been able to persuade my own institution (and I suspect that most of you are in the same boat) even to set up a local table-of-contents service by xeroxing the tables of contents of the journals as they come in. I wonder if they're going to put out the dough for SDI? Brad Rogers discovered that it cost him two hundred bucks to make a search of Index Medicus annually, and it cost him two hundred bucks to make the same search on a computer. It worked out about the same. My question is, what medical school would give a member of the faculty two hundred bucks to have a literature search done for him, unless he has to have it done on a machine?

You know, I really think that something is wrong with our sense of values when we're spending something on the order of thirty magabucks to investigate automation activities in libraries, and we haven't got control of our own basic literature on the most rudimentary level, and we're talking about high brow SDI services. I'm in favor of SDI, believe me, I would be a delighted customer if somebody would give me this, but before I get it I would like to have a nice retrospective listing, so I'd at least have an even break when I go into the library to make a search. End of sermon.

Corrigan

If I can make a point, since I have suggested three levels, three types of service, I would obviously think the first thing to do is to pour money or whatever staff into the existing services, whether we're talking about Library Literature or Library Science Abstracts.

I don't think either of these services alter the need for a current awareness service, but they do exist. They are valuable as they stand. Let's first put money into reforming these. Perhaps simultaneously we must think about the current awareness service, but I didn't put these in the order in my paper in which we should think about them. I don't think we should first think about current awareness, secondly about the comprehensive record, or third about library science abstracts.

I think we should start as soon as possible, this year if possible, to reform the existing services, get funds for them, get staff, get them organized, and then go on to think about new services.

Harris

I'm a little bit hesitant here, I think mainly it's because I'm under thirty that I'm having some problems with some of the comments that have been made.

First of all, I would like to say that librarians have been flying by the seat of their pants for some time, and if Dr. Shera is implying that intuition is the basic ingredient for library administration, I'd like to disagree with him, and possibly issue a challenge here. Young librarians don't agree at all with that point of view, and we're more concerned, I think, with the research. I'd be the first to agree, of course, that practical experience and administrative ability are necessary, and most of us will yield to the experience that is certainly sitting around this table here. But, I think, too oftentimes librarians (and I'm a little surprised to see Dr. Shera doing it) attempt to disparage research. I'm always glad to see three million bucks pumped into research on automation. I think the fact that we're able to get money for those projects simply means that a lot of us are a little more aggressive in this area, in terms of wanting to do research.

Wilson Company has some basic problems, of course, getting a federal grant to support their services. I think that's kind of a silly problem to consider anyway. The government probably isn't going to fund H. W. Wilson to prepare a bibliography. So that's one thing I think we should take care of.

As far as cooperative indexing and bibliography are concerned, I suspect Dr. Shera and almost everybody else around this table is too busy for that sort of thing, and you probably shouldn't be involved in it. But I know among my own colleagues, people my own age, many who work consistently in this area. Almost all of us are doing book reviewing; we have a kind of current awareness service among ourselves, and we're only too happy to cooperate on this basis. I think I could probably name three or four hundred fairly competent people that would be perfectly willing to take part in cooperative projects, either on a national or an international basis. I don't think we should scratch off the cooperative possibilities at all. In fact, in my paper, I suggested maybe this would be a way for Wilson to extend their coverage, and I still think it's probably the easiest and most efficient way to do it.

Batty

Any greybeards care to try for that?

Hines

There was some kind of an implication, because I said my institution got three million bucks to put into research and automation of libraries, that I didn't believe in research. I don't understand that at all. The only statement that I was trying to make was that if we put this much money into research, into developing good procedures, and if we are supposed to be information types, the least we can do is to be sure that the information on our own discipline is made availabe to people.

Now, I'm heartily in favor of all kinds of research. In fact, I spend most of my time trying to do it. But I don't see why I can't say at the same time, okay, we need to spend research money in this area, but right now we need to have a service that is a going service, not something that is based on experimental evidence or what have you. But that service must be alive to change, must be as adaptable as possible, and must do as much research as possible. What's wrong with spending a quarter of a million bucks on putting the literature of information retrieval in order, if you're willing to put three million bucks into one relatively narrow aspect of library automation? This is a question of scale of values, that's all.

Corrigan

Well, I'm not a greybeard, but I'd like to comment on this business about voluntary indexing. We seem to be using two definitions of the word "voluntary." I don't know whether this is a transatlantic confusion, but to me the word "voluntary" means, _you_ do it. There's no payment, no backing by a library school or anything. _You_ do the thing; _you_ notice something in a journal, and _you_ send in a five-by-three card to Wilson.

The sort of thing Andrew Osborn was talking about does not seem to be voluntary, in the sense that I normally use it. He's got backing there from the library school. There is a paid, monied thing. To me the way that voluntary services, in my definition, could work--just the person reading a journal and noticing something and sending it to Wilson--would be as a supplement. The main work of Wilson and _Library Science Abstracts_ must be to work in the areas which this conference, or the profession, or the funding agency, agree are the areas that are needed. And then the supplement would be from the really way-out articles, way-out in the sense of unusual host journals or unusual publications. And these would be noted down on five-by-threes or whatever form we use, and sent in. But it must be a _supplement_. The service must not rely for its input on voluntary labor.

Atherton

I've said this so often at meetings like this that I had forgotten to say it again here. We're talking now about secondary services primarily, and talking about voluntary help, paid or otherwise, for these secondary services, and we forget that we have a captive audience under the control of the editors of the report series and of the journals and books that are published who could also be part of that "voluntary service."

Now it just so happens that Dave brought together two people to sit side-by-side who disagree on this subject of author-assisted indexing or categorization. The debate in science about using author abstracts went on for twenty years. But the physicists just said, we'll do it; we'll not accept a paper in our journals unless it has an abstract, and the editor and the referee have the responsibility of looking at these abstracts to make sure that they do indicate something of the content of the paper. As a result of this cooperative process, the physicists have begun to provide author-assisted indexing. If you look at Nuclear Physics, for instance, a journal published in Holland with contributors from all over the world, you will find a categorization at the top of every article according to a fixed classification scheme that's assigned by the author himself, with aid of the editor, before it is ever printed. It can be used by people to cut out and arrange for their own personal files, or it can be used by a secondary service to know where to put it in a fixed list or in a category list. Presently, I think for the past two years, the authors have also been attaching indexing phrases so that these could be lifted by secondary services, whether they're information centers or whether they're abstracting and indexing services.

There's also an effort called the International Nuclear Information Service, which now puts the burden on the country where the work has originated to make sure that when the copy of the journal or report goes to Oak Ridge for Nuclear Science Abstracts, it comes with either an author abstract or an abstract produced within that country. With it come the indexing phrases from the thesaurus used by Nuclear Science Abstracts. For four years, Euratom and Nuclear Science Abstracts have been exchanging indexing for journals that one is covering that the other is not, so that they have both a U.S. based as well as a European based secondary service for mechanized retrieval.

The source of a lot of our help is in the journals themselves, and I think it is a crime that our own field hasn't done more toward getting the primary journal publishers in library science together to make sure that they do something to help the secondary services that we're talking about in this area. It should be a function of the primary journals and of the publishing field to be involved in the cycle of services that are going to be used on a secondary level. They may not reap any immediate reward, but they must be persuaded that eventually it's going to be of help and that it's useful.

Batty

It seems to me that the discussion so far has almost agreed tacitly, implicitly, for the sake of argument, on Philip Corrigan's three categories: that a current awareness service, an indexing service, and an abstracting service are desirable, indeed essential, though there is disagreement on the order in which these might appear.

If there is any general feeling on this, it seems to me that the middle one, the comprehensive record, an index of some kind, becomes a favorite. At the same time, there are three ways in which it might be produced: (1) from the top, as it were, by a company like H. W. Wilson, or at least by an authority providing the index language and applying it, funded necessarily very heavily from somewhere or other, (2) by volunteer service, people helping when they can and how they can, (3) or by getting back to the author and saying, we can't do the indexing, you have to.

Is it fair, and can we ever trust the author to index his own material? If we don't believe we can always trust him to index his own material, then obviously we have to stand over him with a language of some kind that he will use under our direction. But then we're back in the business of doing the indexing, only a second removed, and with the bother that we have recalcitrant authors who are going to argue with us all the time.

Stevens

We have one very small group of material that is author indexed, and done essentially by people under thirty, that is the indexing of the library school theses, and it's wild! We even have great difficulty using it; in most cases we revise the indexing suggested by the authors on the thesis forms.

I have one other request. I would not like to spend the rest of my professional life known as Ted Hines' mother.

Batty

If we can't trust the author to provide the relevant terms, then we can't trust amateurs to handle the relevant terms. Can we even, and I think this has been questioned implicitly already this afternoon, tell people to make up decent profiles of themselves for an SDI service?

Atherton

I'm really going to say something perhaps shocking now. Do you know who you're talking about when you say they don't know how to index, and they do a lousy job? You're talking about the people who are doing cataloging and classification and subject analysis in our libraries. You're talking about the leaders in the field who are writing the literature about bibliographic organization, and you're saying they can't even apply the tools we have to do the work on their own writing. This is a horrible indictment. I don't think it's the people who are the problem. It's the tools we give them to do the indexing.

Hines

I think that author indexing is partly a matter of structure. Obviously author-and-editor produced abstracts have been very broadly and successfully used. Nonetheless, the tendency of Chemical Abstracts has been to do less and less of sending out stuff to be abstracted and to do it in-house. This is partly a time-delay problem as well as the problem of getting good abstracts. Author indexing is kind of another kettle of fish, and I would like to make some observations about it.

An enormous effort has gone in, in recent years, to get author and/or editor indexing done by the use of thesauri. The Engineers Joint Council put more dough into this than one can imagine. I only know of one journal that publishes these terms and also actually uses them in its own index. A number of the journals which provide these terms, that are published with the articles, not only don't use them in their own index, but there is no secondary indexing service as far as I can tell, which uses any of them.

Historically, we've tried cooperative indexing at various times, and the difficulties are not lack of intelligence on the part of the indexer, but lack of knowledge of the structure of the index, lack of appropriate working framework in which to put the stuff. And I don't think a list, or thesaurus, is that helpful. The Library of Congress, for example, for years has used the subject headings turned in under the cooperative cataloging program, and they are hardly really satisfactory, even though the definition of what is to be done is quite clear in comparison to most other definitions of this kind.

I think that this has really turned out to be an academic argument. What I don't understand is why there seems to be an unwillingness in the profession to put a reasonable amount of money into handling the indexing centrally. Nobody I've heard yet has argued that centralized indexing is poorer than author indexing. Now, I have heard arguments that author indexing is poorer than centralized indexing.

Batty

We have been talking about who's going to do the indexing, and what kind of indexing will be done. We have ignored, if I may put it like this, the best, most logical, and finest, method of organizing any volume of information: classification, and particularly, faceted classification.

Atherton

This is the route physicists have gone, and this is background which I think will help us when we see our history spread out over five or ten years the way I can reflect back now over the developments in physics.

Long ago the major physics abstracting and indexing services in the world, each representing a different language, agreed to categorize their abstracting services according to UDC. So that regardless of the language of the abstracting journal, you could pinpoint, if you were a physicist, the area of acoustics, or whatever, regardless of the abstracting service.

This was a cooperative arrangement between them. It worked for quite a while until nuclear physics and especially solid state physics came into the picture. Then UDC couldn't keep up with physics as it was going. The journals all, in their own independent ways, reorganized their abstracting services to fit the new literature. There is now an effort (granted, only in the English language) to redo the arrangement of Physics Abstracts, but they're doing it in cooperation with the journal editors of the American Institute of Physics that have in their control at least a third of the world's published journal literature in physics. They'll be using a faceted scheme with one of the major facets being the categories in the monthly issues. And all of the facets will also be represented in what we would tend to call the alphabetic or permuted arrangements that appear in the so-called indexes, either monthly, semiannually, or annually. This is an arrangement which will provide for: (1) a uniform categorization of all of physics literature plus an indexing scheme for individual journals, and (2) a cooperative cumulative indexing scheme. Again, I can't say too strongly how important it is to get close to the source for assistance in organizing journal or series report literature.

Osborn

What you just said, Dave, I think is very much to the point and deserves a tremendous amount of attention and research. I don't go along with you on one point, and that is the possibilities in a faceted scheme, because a faceted scheme to me is still the logic of classes. I think we've got to get over to a propositional logic.

I think the lesson that Mort Taube has taught us has gone largely unobserved. In the forties, Mort was put in charge of the Science and Technology Project of the Library of Congress, and he said that the traditional controls just didn't serve research. He was unable to get the Library of Congress to respond. With a great deal of courage, Mort resigned and set up his own company, and he was so right that within ten years he was a millionaire.

There is the need for a totally different kind of control for information today. We'll always go on wanting the simple approach, the logic of classes, but side-by-side with that we do have the relational. Mort put that in the form of coordinate indexing, and I think the next step beyond coordinate indexing has to be the development of a relational scheme that is immediately operative, that is preprogrammed in effect, because we can't really take the time to sit down and program every request that's relational in character each time it comes up.

And that's why for my new school, I decided that a computer-based classification had to be developed. It's only a rough and ready scheme for the students to work with. I was very unhappy that we couldn't persuade the Council on Library Resources to put some money into the development of such a scheme. We do need a tremendous amount of research in this respect, but I did look at the Classification Research Group's faceted classification scheme for library science, which you very nicely sent to me, Dave, to see if that would serve our purposes for computer controls. And looking at it very carefully, I just had to shut my eyes to it and have my people start in a totally different direction. Fundamentally, the problem there was that the faceted scheme was still an extension of the logic of classes, and so it really wasn't the answer.

I do think we've learned a tremendous amount from Ranganathan and the faceted approach. This was a systematic approach as against the approach that very largely was based on intuition. When we classify, when we assign subject headings in libraries, we're using our very good intuition, and Ranganathan entered the picture, with his mathematical background, saying that we had to be much more systematic.

I think what you said is extremely important, that the future is going to lie with a classified approach rather than thesaurus, subject heading, or any other verbal approach, but so far I haven't been able to see the possibilities in the faceted. I see more possibilities in UDC which is a limited relational system, but I can't see any way of making UDC a fully relational system.

Batty

I'm not going to break my rule and begin talking about indexing in general. We can talk about it afterwards. I think since it's heading on towards three o'clock, and although there is obviously still a great deal to discuss in this field, we're going to have to draw a few threads together.

It seems to me that in the discussion that we've had on the papers for this session, there has been disagreement on detail, but there has been a kind of tacit agreement on the need for a range of services, probably, and almost inevitably based on what exists now, but extending towards the ideals that we as professionals in our own field can see to be essential. And one of the neatest expressions of this range of services, as Joe Becker pointed out, is in Philip Corrigan's paper, where he suggests that what is needed is a current awareness service, a comprehensive indexing service, and a less frequent but detailed abstracting service, that will give us an international coverage that we as the only surviving polymaths will find inevitably essential.

The manner in which these services are organized, the internal structure, the intellectual structure, and the administrative structure that must stand behind them, is something else again. It would be difficult, I think, just immediately and off hand, to say precisely what intellectual methods of organization would be most appropriate at each of these levels.

Then by the papers, and again by some of the implications of the discussion, it seems to me that it may well be the bottom end as it were, the most immediate end, the current awareness end, requiring the quick and earthy approach of the machine, that will use something much nearer a natural language approach than any of the other services. At the other extreme, getting away from all brawn and no brains, we have much more highly sophisticated categorization, at the level of the abstracting service where there is a much greater need because people can define at leisure the possible limits of their need to know. Here the approach must be the systematic approach of a classification scheme of some kind.

And I'd like to just make one remark about this now. I would like to make a point that classification does not necessarily imply classification scheme. It is simply a systematic approach. The systematic approach often manifests itself in classification schemes, and we know what most of those look like. But when we think of them in our mind's eye, we think of notation, because we think of the appearance of those schemes on the page. And I think this is dangerous. It is possible to organize a body of material in a systematic way that is, in fact, a classified way, and never use anything that looks like notation. A properly organized natural language system becomes a classified, systematic way of organizing things if it is structured in that way. It is a matter of internal structure. It's just a point to make.

There have been several comments on the way in which we could get the indexing done. Should it be voluntary, subsidized, or should we just compel the author it do it? It seems to me that the more sophisticated the index language the more difficult it is to imagine some librarians of our acquaintance indexing their own material well. The catalogers and classifiers might, but how about some of the others? I'm not even sure that I would always trust the catalogers and the classifiers either. They always have an opinion. We all have our own little variations, which usually lead us into some kind of trouble sooner or later. We need authority, perhaps.

I'm not putting these forward, in giving some kind of random summary, as imposed points. These are points that have been raised and discussed. So we have then, in providing the services that this morning's discussion looked for, an outline of (1) a rapid, immediate and all-embracing current awareness service that may not be of the greatest priority, (2) a comprehensive index record of some kind that seems to be, in most people's minds, of the greatest priority, perhaps because it could be so easily matured and built out of what we have already in, say, Library Literature, and (3) a much more leisurely and detailed abstracting service with a wider coverage.

One of the problems we're going to have to get into, when we think of implementation of this kind of thing, is where does the money come from and how is it apportioned, which is something that has not really been discussed yet.

But with that somewhat random summary, Venable, we can leave for the coffee break. We will reassemble at 3:30.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, April 19th: 3:30 PM. David Mitchell, Moderator

Mitchell

For the benefit of some of the people for whom this is the first session, we've had two sessions before in which the conversation was confined to just the people you see on the platform here. This session, if it seems a little fragmentary to you, is a chance for everyone who hasn't had a chance to talk, particularly the people out here, to direct questions to any of the panelists, to make a statement, to add information that we haven't put into the discussion, or to ask a question of your colleagues at large.

We haven't talked too much about library school libraries per se, and a good number of you are library school librarians who are responsible for building collections in that area. If you would like to address questions of a general nature to your colleagues whom you will be working with tomorrow morning in the small group sessions, or if you want to suggest topics that we haven't taken up that should be taken up in that session tomorrow morning, this is the time to do it.

Ed, did you have a question?

Colburn

Something that Ted Hines said this afternoon seemed to indicate there was some confusion, which there always is, as to who provided the money for this conference. To those of you who are not associated with the Foundation, it probably doesn't seem to make any difference. But to those of us who have responsibilities in the Wilson Company and the Wilson Foundation it does, because we are constantly being watched by the Internal Revenue Service; they are looking over our shoulders, and we always stress when a grant is made that it is the Foundation and not the Company.

While I'm up here, I would like to say that one of the reasons I'm at this conference is that we're interested in what you're talking about. We want to provide the very best service that we can to the library profession in all of our publications. Sometimes we feel we don't know exactly what you need. For this reason the Committee on Wilson Indexing was created. It was for this reason that we have the committee which advises us on the Index to Legal Periodicals. It was for this reason that we have the consultants for our Standard Catalogs. A few years ago we did bring in a group of about twenty people to advise us on Library Literature. We probably would have done it again if we hadn't known that this conference was coming up. We're here to listen, to hear what you have to say, and to assure you that we are ready to co-operate to the very best of our ability in whatever you suggest we should do in giving you what you need. Thank you.

Mitchell

These open sessions sessions are usually slow starting. We'll conduct this one at first like a Quaker Meeting. I will stand up here in silence and when someone is moved, please raise your hand or come to the microphone. Direct what questions you want to whomever you wish to direct them. So, silence until someone breaks it.

Griffin

I am Margaret Griffin from Indiana University. I'm interested in knowing, if ACRL collects reports, are they going to be current or retrospective?

Holley

At Bal Harbor, the ACRL Publications Committee considered the nature of ACRL's Micro-card Series and did adopt a statement saying that this series should be changed. As you know, it was largely library school master's theses up to that point, and so the Committee did adopt the statement saying that annual reports, both from libraries in this country and from abroad, was one of the great needs, and that when the format is changed, it is probable that microfiche will be the new format. I don't know how this fared subsequently in executive board meetings. My assumption is that it will try to do both retrospective and current, but the only thing that I know for sure is that it has been recommended and that it will include not only annual reports but other types of fugitive material as well in this new series.

Bohnert

Perhaps it would be useful at this point, if it wasn't settled before, to stop talking about library needs and to start talking about various types of librarians, and then perhaps their "needs." I think Pauline Atherton started to, in her discussion of the various types of physicists.

Atherton

I would suggest that we might consider tackling the user population that we're referring to by encouraging an expansion of something like Pat Knapp's study of library school users at Wayne State and also consider tackling some of the other user populations as strata of the whole user group that we're interested in. They did this in the American Psychological Association, first concentrating on the people who were the authors of the literature and next tackling the people who attended conferences. And then they took other groups that apparently weren't right on the forefront of psychology.

Simonton

As I was indicating in my remarks, I do think it's important to try to identify the various segments of our field, and I personally find it useful to think of ALA structure, with its type-of-activity divisions and type-of-library divisions. And I have this definitely in mind as I think about what services ERIC should be providing and to whom.

It's very easy in almost any discussion, any conference such as this, to spend all of our time on the information sciences, on information retrieval, on this side of the profession. But it is very important for us to be aware of the needs of the school librarian, the small public librarian, the small college librarian, and so on. And I think this has certain implications for us as we try to decide what our services are. Whether, for example, we have a comprehensive accession list, produced through ERIC or whether we have a classified accession list with various segments of it available to various segments of the community.

I don't think I really need to say anymore about that, but as long as I'm on my feet, let me emphasize that ERIC is very interested in coordinating its activities with existing activities. We certainly do not see ourselves as coming into this field and taking over. We are not funded at a level that would permit this in the first place, but even more, we are interested in cooperation. We have already had some discussions with Documentation Abstracts on our relationships. I sat in on two or three meetings with Mr. Whatley and Ben Lipetz and Jane Stevens and others, where we had rather inconclusive discussions, I suppose, but at least discussions of "who is doing what?" and "where can we go from here?"

Corrigan

Could I extend a plea that any surveys being made of at least the English language block are not restricted to the U.S., or at least that we coordinate any activities. We're not that big a profession that we couldn't take a language block, like the English language block, and any surveys that are done are coordinated within that block, whether it's faculty or public librarians or school librarians.

I would like to repeat what I said in my paper, that as well as surveying users we could effectively survey the actual information profile of library science and information science. What is published for whom, by whom and so on. This has never been done in a systematic way.

Batty

I'm not sure if I'm about to ask a kind of general question or just throw out a kind of assumption for everyone else to jump on. It would be, I'm sure, as it would be in every field, when we consider the informational needs of that field, instructive, invaluable and important to conduct surveys of different classes of users, to identify these users as different kinds of librarians, as student librarians, faculty of library schools and school librarians and so on. But I wonder, if in fact the kind of surveys that we've just been discussing would reveal only a similarity in their results when we look at different kinds of librarians. What we ought to be looking at, instead, is not the kinds of librarians but the kinds of use librarians as individuals make of the literature. And almost any sample would do.

Corrigan

If I maybe permitted to break in, I disagree with what David said. I think that previous surveys of users have shown that different needs exist, that we're not all interested in the same kind of librarianship, in the same level librarianship.

The other point I would make is that I hope that any survey which is done, would also cover the primary publication patterns of librarianship, and the people who use the primary patterns, not how they reach the journal articles, but how they use journals in a general way, use books in a general way, use research reports.

Lauer

I'd like to bring the discussion to a more specific problem, that of audio-visual materials which I believe Mr. Becker mentioned. He threw it out at one point. It was never caught up. Audio-visual materials are proliferating to a great extent and have become sort of a problem, both in storage and in information retrieval for all of us. I'd like to know to what extent they will be bibliographically controlled and/or can be successfully integrated in the existing bibliographic arrangements, and to what extent we can then hope to make use of this possible bibliographic control for acquisition of audio-visual material.

Stevens

Library Literature does list some audio-visual material with library science content. We do list the films, recruiting films, story telling films. We list teaching aids when we find them. They make very peculiar entries sometimes. I just received from Syracuse yesterday a sheet of fifty sample title pages and a teaching packet from Mr. Nitecki, and I have to make up an entry for that to describe it so that it will make sense to the users of the index when they find it under "Cataloging--instruction and teaching," or whatever we use.

But we do list it and we index it if the content is important to library science. We started indexing the ACRL micro-card series. I cannot think of anything we haven't indexed at some time or another. We do some recordings, but they all must have library science content.

Mitchell

Jane, how much of what is available do you have a feeling you see? Is it just what comes to you by chance?

Stevens

There isn't very much that I'm aware of. In ALA committees you hear references to the need for a list of audio-visual teaching materials, and there is the feeling that there are many good sets of audio-visual aids around the country that other people don't know about. I heard of one of them this afternoon.

Batty

I applaud the attention that has been paid to the problems of audio-visual materials. It's entirely necessary, but I am also faintly disturbed by it. I think it exhibits, it reveals, the same kind of schizophrenia that we saw discussed this morning when we find ourselves on the one hand telling everybody in every other subject that they should use the literature, and have good indexing services, and that kind of thing, and we don't have it ourselves.

Here we are reminding ourselves, having to remind ourselves indeed about audio-visual materials, "non-book" materials. It's another of those revealing phrases that librarians keep on using, like "non-fiction" and "special libraries." (What's so special about a special library? Why should we call it non-fiction----that which is not untrue?) So we get "non-book" materials. But all materials contain the subject that we're interested in. Although we go around exhorting everybody else to remember that the book is outdated and that it's now a journal literature, a serial literature, non-book materials of one kind or another, still we find that we have to remind ourselves in our own field that these materials exist.

Mitchell

Dean Shera, at the outset of the first session, said that he thought that the problem of the administration and organization of library school libraries is something that was not really in our province to talk about, but it does fit in somewhat with what David said. As far back as 1947, James Stewart in his Tabulation of Librarianship, used the proverb of the shoemaker's children in pointing out that no one had done a classification for librarianship.[8] This same proverb applies in many cases, I think, to library services for librarians. We tell our students of that critical service that a library and a librarian can perform for any organization, and yet look at library school libraries. Look at library school librarians and the way they're considered. Someone told me that he had written for a job to a library school that was advertising for a library school librarian, and the school wrote back and said he was "over-qualified" for the job.

---

[8] James Douglas Stewart, Tabulation of Librarianship; Classified Tables for the Arrangement of All Material Relating to Library Economy. London, Grafton, 1947.

Reed

I'd like to hear what you people think about the present possibility for the continuing review of this matter? I think it's excellent for this group to have the opportunity to consider these problems and these plans, but I also think that for our profession for the next ten years or the next fifty years, that it's too important to trust to a one-shot deal for on-going policy and on-going evaluation. I wonder where you people feel that the responsibility for continuing review of our literature will get sound and responsible leadership and direction.

Lipetz

I believe firmly that people are basically lazy, and that they act when there's a good reason to act, and I think that's just the way people should be. I think the responsibility will arise where the pressure arises. And the library profession, setting aside the training part of the profession, seems to have two different areas of activity. A great many people are engaged in the business of conducting service operations to help other people. If they are under pressure to improve the service or to change the service, they will be interested in innovation and they will necessarily, as a part of their job, review new material and try to keep up with the field because they want to keep their jobs. If they don't have such pressure on them, and I firmly believe that many people don't, then they will not review new material and I wouldn't expect them to.

I think there is a small part of the library field, not the library manager, but rather the library scientist or information scientist, if you will, whose profession is to innovate. And, like the scientist or the chemist or the physicist that Pauline was talking about, his recognition or his professional status depends upon innovation and the study of the literature and always being ahead and figuring out new ways in which to serve people. So I don't think that we need to worry about fixing responsibility if that is pertinent to the question that was asked. I think responsibility will find people as the pressure applies.

Atherton

I think we're both blessed and cursed with the services from H. W. Wilson Company. We have a commercial organization that has been so service-minded for our own field, that we have really delegated that responsibility to the Company and haven't assumed it ourselves through the ALA. It may in some ways be analagous to what happened in astronautics, where the American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics had an abstracting service that limped along for several years with the support of its professional group until guided missiles and all the rest were developed. That was something they couldn't cope with, and the Government really got involved and established NASA, and had the difficult time of controlling the literature of the field. They decided what I think we're eventually going to have to decide to do in our field. They decided, as you probably know, to split responsibility between the private AIAA and the Government, and it is done in a coordinated fashion with, I think, a great deal of subsidization. There is a control of both the journal literature (the open literature) and the report literature, with mutually compatable thesauri and machine systems. It is a quite unusual arrangement between the government and a private organization to control the literature that the government feels needs to be controlled, because it's in the national interest.

Now, maybe that's the way ERIC at Minnesota and the H. W. Wilson Company are going to have to cooperate. It's very interesting to me that even though ALA established the new Information Science and Automation Division, to the best of my knowledge they are not involved in the tripartite Documentation Abstracts control. Here Special Libraries Association, the old ADI, and the Chemical Literature section of the American Chemical Society have banded together.

[Here there is a gap in both the audiotape and stenotype recordings.]

Simonton

Certainly the area of government-sponsored research reports will be one that ERIC will be very concerned with, and we already are beginning to include many such reports in the abstracts which we are providing for Research in Education. And in that connection I would like to have some indication if library school libraries are using U.S. Government Research and Development Reports Index widely to identify and obtain materials. If you are, then ERIC does not have quite so much obligation here. Are you using this as a source, and are you acquiring fiches and hard copies of the materials from the Federal Clearinghouse?

Hines

I have horrible fears about what may happen if we depend on the Government Research and Development Reports Index. It does not cumulate; it is not cumulatable. The subarrangement is unusuable. The only way in which you can conceivably use it is to browse through all the thesauri, collect your headings, and go through each issue as it comes out. It has no retrospective value. If we don't get coverage of the report literature that includes reports other than those covered by the Clearinghouse series, and if we don't get some kind of retrospective searching mechanism, we will go mad.

Trying to accumulate the government research reports is one of the roughest jobs I have ever seen. It has not been helped by Mr. Carlson taking away the technical report centers in the universities. These cost the government $30,000 a year, but in a wave of economy, in order to cut down on people who were getting something for nothing----have you ever heard of a government contractor that was cut down on----the federal government eliminated these things.

If we don't watch out, we really are going to be in a situation where our material is splintered by form, indexed in indexes which cannot be used retrospectively and are very difficult to use for current awareness services, and in worse trouble than we are at present.

Corrigan

Could I make a point? We've already gone mad, by the way, in the United Kingdom trying to get hold of your government reports. The particular problem you've just mentioned is one where, I believe, Library Literature could poach or feed on other indexing services.

That is what I meant when I said that Library Literature should become comprehensive. We could turn to Library Literature, an index that cumulates, and find in there the government reports. We might use something else for a fast access service, but we would turn to Library Literature for the retrospective search.

McFarland

I'd just like to say as a matter of record on this GRDR Index, that DDC has just choked up with a two volume index, each volume this thick, retrospective for 1953-66, I think, listing all the AD reports pertinent to Information Science and Technology. To add to what Ted Hines said, it's almost as unusable as the GRDR Index, and contains on each page an abstract of the document with the descriptors used. It has a very rudimentary subject classification at the beginning, and it's all grouped that way. But it is indexed by AD number, and it is indexed by author and corporate author. So, no matter in what shape it is subject-wise, it does exist now, and it may help us someway with those back items.

Atherton

I would hope if ERIC does duplicate (and I think it might be a useful service to duplicate what the Federal Clearinghouse is doing) that they won't create another report number. Then we would have to order the microfiches from ERIC rather than from the Federal Clearinghouse. I for one have found the Federal Clearinghouse to be the most efficient document retrieval systems known to man. You get the coupons that are punched cards and you just write the AD number on it and write your name and address on it, and back in less than a week comes the microfiche for $.65, regardless of whether it's one page long or almost three hundred pages. And this is really rapid access to the report literature, if you know the report number ahead of time. Now, if, in the case of ERIC, they decide to add an ERIC number and do not duplicate the PB number or the AD number they're going to do us a real disservice. Because we should be able to choose which government agency we want to do business with for microfiche or hard copy retrieval.

I have found the most useful tool for getting this material is not the GRDR Index, but the Annual Review, because in the citations for the Annual Review, in the chapter on Library Automation, are all the AD and PB numbers. So at least for the last three years this has been a useful tool for rapid access, at least for me.

Simonton

Just to answer the simple question, there will be an ERIC accession number on our entries for these, but you will not obtain them through the ERIC system, but rather through the Federal Clearinghouse.

Lazorick

I'd like to make a comment to Ted Hines about the cumulative index, or the lack of a cumulative index, to the GRDR Index. The Clearinghouse just announced about a week ago, quarterly cumulation for the next four quarters at a relatively low annual cost, $3.00 I believe, on an experimental basis for a year. Because they're looking for a demand so they can continue it. So get your licks in now.

Hines

The trouble is that under some of these headings, you have to read everything in it for a number of pages and make due allowance for the fact that corporate entries are different for different things, and that the arrangement doesn't make any sense in a rational way. I can't see how they can cumulate this without adding to the problems.

Lazorick

I'm commenting on the availability, not on the quality.

Osborn

I'm afraid we're letting the question asked by the editor of Library Literature go by the boards, and I just don't want to. I would be very unhappy if there were any thought of confining Library Literature to the material in English. I hope it was a rhetorical question.[9] We are a truly international discipline. We don't, within the country, within the English language block, represent all library wisdom. We just must have true international coverage.

In 1940 when we made the survey of the Library of Congress, there were a number of situations that bothered us very much. At that time there was a chief of the Slavonic Division who refused to get any Soviet material on the score that every penny should go into pre-1917 material, and he did the Library of Congress and the country a great disservice by failing to gather material in from the Soviet Union.

At the same time the Oriental Division refused to get anything from Japan. There was a little Japanese girl in the Oriental Division; she had been a student of mine at the University of Michigan. She felt she couldn't appear before the committee, but she could come and talk to me as one of her former instructors. The story she had to tell was that the Library of Congress liked China, so it got everything relating to China; it didn't like Japan, so it got nothing about Japan. And she said with the way events were developing, it was extremely important for the Library of Congress to get material in Japanese. Pearl Harbor followed not so long afterwards, and it was a great tragedy that material in Japanese wasn't gathered for the good of the country.

---

[9] The question was raised by Miss Stevens during the previous unrecorded interval.

There is a national responsibility to gather information in any language whatsoever. We would be doing a great disservice to our profession, we would be making ourselves a profession that operated at a parochial level, if we disregarded what was going on in other great library countries. So I hope very much that that question was a rhetorical one, that we will gather in the information, in whatever language it is, and make it available through the bibliographic controls.

Luik

I just wanted support Mr. Osborn's statement that it would be a great loss if the foreign library literature is dropped from Library Literature. I feel really it would be a great loss. Where else could we find it?

Clark

I'm a most unselfish person; I love everybody, but I want to argue with Dr. Osborn for suggesting one index has to do everything when I certainly respect Library Science Abstracts. In working with my own library school students, seventy-five per cent of the time they're using Library Literature, but when they have to describe the services of libraries in other countries, it's the Library Science Abstracts that they go to.

Mitchell

The difference, of course, is that there is an abstract in English, in Library Science Abstracts. But at the same time it is selective. Right, Allan?

Whatley

Perhaps I might add a few words to describe how we collect the abstracts relating to foreign literature. As far as possible, I try to find abstractors in the countries concerned, where they have a good knowledge of English. They volunteer to supply the abstracts, and in most cases they are in suitable English. They hardly need any editing. In other cases, we have to make use of people in Britain who have a knowledge of foreign languages and who are keen enough to do this work of translation and abstracting. Again, it relies very heavily on the volunteer system. The payment is infinitesimal really; it's some small contribution to them.

The other point is I've been very much touched by the references, both today and when I was here back in October for the ADI Annual Convention, by the number of people who have spoken to me privately and praised the foreign language abstracts which they find in LSA. So in that sense, I am encouraged.

Thank you very much.

Atherton

Well, Jane can continue to index things, but if I can't get hold of them to look at when I find them listed in Library Literature, it's not going to do me any good. This is the problem. There is a real need for a backup service. To my knowledge, there isn't any way of knowing where to locate this document once it's listed in Library Literature. Isn't that true? The Chemical Abstract Service helps you find those journals they cite that are not easily accessible. Their list of journals that they scan records the holdings of the major libraries of the country, so that if you don't have access to something, they'll tell you which library may have it, and they will also keep a supply in Columbus, so that you can get the things that they have covered. We don't have such a backup service.

I wish you library science librarians wouldn't sit there so quietly but would tell us some of the things you're doing that amount to cooperative inter-library loan or acquisition or union listing of serials among library schools. It's one thing to know something exists; it's another to try to get it. It's very frustrating. Most librarians don't worry about library science literature.

They worry about the literature of the other fields. And our own literature is elusive, very elusive, for getting hold of xerox copies or back issues when our own library doesn't have it.

We just started and then had to abandon a cooperative effort with Indiana. Date Gull put the Indiana serials list in machinable form. He gave me a deck of punched cards, and I was going to use them and compare their list with what we had at Syracuse. Is the Indiana librarian here?

Griffin The serials listed were not only in the library school at Indiana but also in the main library.

Atherton Only serials that were of interest to library science?

Griffin Well, those that were in Library Literature. We had intended to expand in May. It very probably will be continued.

Atherton I'd love to hear that this is something that is going to be compared with the list at Columbia, Case-Western, Berkeley, wherever, so that we would begin to have a union list of holdings of library science periodicals.

Griffin It has been very beneficial to us, because we are adding on the basis of what we've found.

Mitchell

Both of these things that you've mentioned, Pauline, the union list of serials and the question of cooperative acquisition of foreign materials, I hope will be topics that the work sessions of librarians tomorrow morning will take up. I have been working with the special committee on library school libraries for LED. Some of the suggestions that they've gathered include both of these things.

I think we should break up soon unless someone has something so pressing that we can't get to it tomorrow in our work sessions. So let's break now. Thank you very much for your really hard work and a long day.

The bar opens at seven o'clock in the Patroon Lounge.

(Whereupon, the meeting of the 3:30 PM session, April 19, 1968 was adjourned)

SATURDAY MORNING SMALL GROUP SESSIONS, April 20th: 9:00 AM

In the course of the first day, and the evening before, the participants had come to know each other informally. By the second evening informal discussion of the issues was rife and, as it turned out, very fruitful. The formal high point of the Conference came during the small group work sessions the next morning, which were not recorded. Each group reported the results of its discussion, in the form of recommendations, to the final full session of the Conference. The reports of the six work groups, and the discussion at the final session, were the basis for the final Summary of Recommendations issued by the Conference Editorial Committee.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, April 20th: 1:00 PM. Venable Lawson, Coordinator

Lawson

We are keeping on schedule so therefore we will have a report from each of the group leaders and the two moderators. At the end of the complete report we will have some discussion, if you would like to ask questions or make comments in conjunction with it.

Dick Heinzkill was group chairman for group number one. I will ask Dick if he will report from that group at this time.

Heinzkill

We started out with the question, was it necessary to identify users of our literature, and a strong feeling was that it was not really necessary to identify them; that we were being led by the documentalists in overstressing the identification of users.

One comment I have to make here is that one member proposed that ADI and AIP and others that produced materials in the field should send materials to *Library Journal* for a listing there.

There was a discussion of the local responsibility for acquiring material that would be of primary interest to historians of libraries and of library science. Out of this discussion came our proposal, and I want to note that our proposal includes control and acquisition of *all* types of library literature.

Another comment. ALA committees deposit, in the ALA Headquarters Library, the material that they have acquired in their committee work, such as library surveys and personnel manuals; and although ALA will make this available through inter-library loan, there are no check lists of what is available, and ALA is really not able to service these collections. We feel this is too bad.

I will now read our proposal.

Group One Recommendations:

A proposal for the cooperative acquisition of library science material:

That ALA should explore the possibility of setting up a cooperative national center or network of regional centers which will acquire current and retrospective library science material, especially the foreign and the fugitive domestic literature.

We seem to be thinking of a center for research libraries for library science.

We also realize the possibility of duplication of ERIC's work.

A proposal to improve the service of Library Literature:

(1) Revise format to include the following:

Arrange the entries under subject headings alphabetically by title.

Retain the complete main entry, especially for monographic literature.

Revise the subject headings continuously to reflect current trends in the literature.

Revise the indexing vocabulary in cooperation with the Library of Congress.

(2) Broaden the coverage to include technical reports and foreign materials of all kinds.

(3) Increase frequency of publication to at least six times a year.

Lawson

Thank you Dick. We will now hear from Ruth White who will report for Group Two.

White

We discussed acquisition lists from the library schools circulating to different schools, or having a joint acquisition list, and we decided that this would not be particularly helpful. It would not have enough use for the library school librarians to warrant the time and money and energy that it would take to compile.

We also discussed cooperative acquisition policies; that is, that different library schools would specialize in certain fields. The opinion of the librarians in our group was that because the library school curriculum varies from time to time and the faculty wants to get everything available rather than to specialize in one particular area, that this would not be practicable or desirable from their point of view.

Group Two Recommendations:

(1) That the four indexing services: Library Literature, Library Science Abstracts, Documentation Abstracts, and Research in Education

  (a) cooperate to avoid duplication of effort in indexing library related materials, making clear the scope and policy of each

  (b) publish more frequently so that materials included will be more up-to-date

  (c) index foreign materials comprehensively, and abstract them selectively in English

  (d) arrange current issue by subject with separate author index, and with chronological arrangement under subject.

(2) UNESCO and IFLA take responsibility for initiating international bibliographic control.

(3) Explore need for, and possibility of, providing translations through a central agency.

Lawson

Sarah Rebecca Reed will report for group three.

Reed

We entitled our report "Library School Librarians' Letter to Santa Claus," and weren't limiting ourselves.

Group Three Recommendations:

In dealing with the **parameters** and problems of bibliographic control in the field of library and information sciences, the approaches should be international, multimedia, and inter-disciplinary.

Group Three recommends:

(1) That there be a current awareness service for the purpose of library school acquisitions. This service would exclude trade monographs and periodicals indexed in Library Literature and Library Science Abstracts or included in the Winckler or Drexel lists.

This service will include:

(a) new periodical titles beginning January, 1968

(b) research reports in librarianship and related fields

(c) foreign publications

(d) offprints and reprints available in multiple copies

(e) promotional materials useful for teaching purposes

(f) library publications and other materials generated by or for libraries, i.e., surveys, directories, statistical reports, handbooks, staff newsletters, procedure manuals, annual reports, and library histories

To achieve this service on an experimental basis, library school librarians would establish a cooperative designed to minimize duplication of effort. They would forward to a coordinator the above types of materials from their region. Bibliographic description will include publisher and price.

(2) That library school librarians should gather significant primary source materials from their regions, i.e., internal correspondence of librarians and other relevant materials. Preparation of listings of such resources should be expedited by the use of uniform procedures and entries.

(3) That there be a comprehensive indexing service for significant English language materials and a comprehensive abstracting service for foreign language materials. Existing services should cooperate to minimize duplication of effort. The indexing service should identify the monographs indexed. The subject headings list should be kept up to date with an effective syndetic apparatus. New headings should be listed on each issue.

(4) That a currency in indexing should be achieved by a service which would appear monthly.

(5) That it is the responsibility of international, national (especially ALA and LA), and regional library associations to supply all association publications to bibliographic services and to library school libraries.

(6) That ALA be urged to take the leadership in securing human and material resources needed for the establishment of the level of bibliographic control recommended by this Conference.

(7) That the ERIC Clearing House for Library and Information Science publish a list of its acquisitions.

Lawson

Thank you, Sarah. And now Group Four. Francis Thackston from the University of Maryland.

Thackston

By the time you get to Group Four, it's more or less a "Me too" situation. We are glad to know that we thought of things that have already been mentioned before.

We were entirely, as we started out, library school librarians, and we want to urge very strongly that there be a continuing and progressive program to identify library school librarians and to provide a place for them to meet to communicate with one another. And the thing we thought of, of course, was to have a section within the Library Education Division of ALA, so that there would be an opportunity for such librarians as were there to be separate and to get together to discuss the things that we want to consider for our libraries.

We were trying to review the sort of collections, the sort of problems we have. We wanted very much to discuss our own collections and our problems specifically, but there wasn't time for that, and we recognize that only if we could get this sense of union, this sense of co-operation between ourselves--we have begun to like ourselves very much today--that only if we could get that built up and strengthened, could we do these things about the collections that we were talking about.

We discussed, of course, the problem of current awareness. We were afraid that yesterday somebody here might be suggesting that current awareness was not needed for our people, that our people were some other kind of intellectual group that did not need current awareness for one reason or the other. We want to go on record as saying very strongly we believe current awareness is an absolute necessity, and we chose our old friends, Library Literature, to concentrate on.

We then discussed very briefly a paper which has not been very much discussed, in which we were all interested, Mr. Herling's and Mr. Lazorick's proposal paper from Buffalo. We went on record as saying that we would be very much in favor of encouraging the State University of New York at Buffalo to approach the Council on Library Resources or some other corporate agency on the prospect of trying a trial run of the project that they described in their paper, "Proposal for Current Awareness Service," and let us know how it comes out. We would like to see them get the money to go ahead with a trial run.

Group Four Recommendations:

1. Recommended, that library school librarians be organized as a section of the Library Education Division A.L.A. with provisions for a regular meeting during ALA Conferences. The organization would be a medium by which to accomplish:
    1. Cooperative acquisition programs with assigned responsibility (geographically or regionally) for specialization by subject or form
    2. Identification and location of special subject strength within a given collection
2. Recommended, that inasmuch as an adequate current awareness service is essential in a profession dealing with information, that existing services (particularly Library Literature) should be improved or reorganized in the following way:
    1. Frequency should be monthly
    2. A thorough consideration and revision of indexing vocabulary (if necessary, preceded by funded research or experimentation in one or more library education programs) which will incorporate deeper indexing, improved syndesis and international coverage
3. Recommended, that Library Literature and/or ALA Bulletin or Library Journal list in a regular place and at regular intervals "fugitive" literature (particularly 25 pages or less) with indications of price and of source in order to facilitate acquisition efforts in library education programs
4. Recommended, that SUNY Buffalo be encouraged to approach the Council on Library Resources or some other appropriate agency for funding a trial run of the project described in "A Proposal for a Current Awareness Service for the Literature of Library and

Information Science" by John Herling and Gerald Lazorick

5. Recommended, that the librarians in library education programs accept as a group Mrs. McFarland's offer to oversee a one-year pilot project based on the receipt of acquisitions lists, with the suggestion that her output be extended beyond contributors to include, at least, all ALA accredited programs. (About six librarians in our group of ten could send lists; four librarians could not)

Lawson

Jane Stevens for Group A.

Group A Recommendations:

1. That this conference transmit directly to the Division of Library Service and Facilities of O. E. the recommendation that it issue RFP's for an investigative program (or a series of investigations) on information exchange within the library profession, and on channels of information from related areas. This should be concerned with the multiplicity of modes of communication, definitions of information needs (whether recognized or not), degree of user satisfaction, etc. The work of the American Psychological Association and the American Institute of Physics would be appropriate examples for the study.

2. Noting the omission of reviews for many important titles in library science and, at the same time, the repetition of reviewing effort in the existing book reviewing columns, and impressed with what psychologists have done in the case of Contemporary Psychology, Group A recommends:

   The establishment of a major monthly reviewing journal, providing substantive critical reviews of important titles and brief critical annotations of works in areas. Coverage should be international in scope, including substantive works in foreign languages. In the case of major controversial publications, the editor might assign more than one reviewer to the same book. Also, the journal should be distributed as a perquisite of ALA membership. Editors of book review sections in current library science journals might want to consider savings which might result from the concentration of book reviewing talent in one place.

3. Group A recommends the establishment of a review of the year's work in librarianship, to based on the literature as selected, organized, and evaluated. It would consist of articles comparable to the LRTS annual review, but expanded and perhaps more substantial. We recommend that each division of ALA take responsibility for seeing that the articles are prepared to cover their respective areas of responsibility. The group prefers publication of a single annual volume but notes the possibility of publication of separate articles also in the journals of the respective divisions.

   A pattern of coverage should be designed to provide flexibility since the several areas of librarianship vary as to the pace of significant change and as to the amount of publication. A cyclical pattern over a period of years, such as that of the Review of Educational Research or the Annual Review of Psychology would be appropriate.

4. In view of the fact that Library Literature is the permanent comprehensive bibliographic base for our profession, Group A strongly urges that Library Literature be expanded and strengthened in both scope and in comprehensiveness to include all significant contributions in the field of librarianship and in other related areas. We view with concern the fact that Library Literature is not able to absorb the material now coming its way. Obviously expansion to handle this material will have to be supported by the subscribers, a fact from which the profession should not flinch in obtaining the kind of comprehensive record the profession needs.

Lawson

Thank you. David Batty will report for Group B.

Batty

I should preface our recommendations, for a very particular reason, with an explanation as to how we arrived at them. We began by considering the profession's services based on many of the comments and the suggestions that were made yesterday outlining them, and then we began to back-peddle. We began to consider the source of philosophy behind this kind of thing and then to go even further back.

We went back so far we were almost out of sight at one point, then we returned, and by the end of a very hard morning, we had produced these recommendations or comments. I say this because I'd like to go on record that the first recommendation, which we think is the foundation of what comes out of here, appears in the beginning of this paper but naturally is one of the last things we arrived at because we moved backwards.

I should stress that we did discuss in some detail the points that have been brought up in discussion about the possible reorganization and extension of Library Literature. We discussed particularly the comprehensive record service and indexing service. It was felt by the end of the morning that it would be far better to concentrate our attention on the international study group on informational patterns, and it would be far easier.

Group B Recommendations:

1. Comprehensive services are needed to control information in the general field of information and library science, with an emphasis on the interests of the research-oriented librarian.
2. An international study group on information patterns is needed to investigate the problems and potential of the field and to guide the future progress. This group would be drawn initially from the English language community.
3. The international study group's responsibilities would include the initiation of studies of users and

information patterns at both primary and secondary levels of information provision and control. It would meet regularly and it would have a small permanent secretariat.

4. The bibliographic services to be considered should be comprehensive of the whole field, ranging from current awareness services to reviews and state-of-the-art reports.

5. The service likely to be of highest priority is a comprehensive record service that indexes all material in information and library science and documentation, and all relevant material in other fields. Its coverage would be world-wide and would include all forms of data, from monographs to digital material and informal sources of research in progress.

6. Another service to be considered would be a current awareness service based on the same collection as the comprehensive record service. The prime characteristic of this is fast access.

7. Another service also based on the same material would be a selective abstracting service to evaluate data and to provide document substitutes, particularly for foreign language material not easily available or not readily comprehensible.

8. The comprehensive record and the selective abstracting services would support other services, most importantly a regular review and a series of state-of-the-art reports.

9. Research in all the areas outlined is urgently needed to work toward a proper balance and provision of the services indicated. Funding must be adequate to avoid uncertain service and development. These matters would become the concern of the international study group.

10. Work toward the establishment of a international study group on information patterns has begun. A working party has already been formed. The following have already volunteered to serve on the working party:

Pauline Atherton
David Batty
Joseph Becker
Philip Corrigan
John Herling
Theodore Hines
Gerald Lazorick
Ben Lipetz
David Mitchell
Andrew Osborn
Wesley Simonton
Allan Whatley

Lawson

Thank you, David.

Now if you have specific questions, comments, or reactions, we will be open for these. If you have comments, we would appreciate them.

Voice

I'd like to ask Group A why you took the recommendation to the Office of Education--that it issue RFP's. I think the initiative should rest with the people that need the work done rather than with the Office of Education. I am concerned about this when you say the O. E. should send out our RFP's. It means Systems Development Corporation, any of the firms engaged in research of this kind, would be bidding for it. Really the initiative should rest with a group such as ours, such as our own.

Stevens

I guess we felt that they had the money to finance it, and that so far the profession had not done it, so we did say the Division of Library Service and Facilities of O. E.

Knapp

We got to talking about how you could originate initiative within the library profession. I think we have the feeling that this conference represents the library profession and that we should not get involved in various other organizations (and the politics of who gets involved). I think the emphasis is not on the Office of Education as taking the initiative, but on this conference as taking the initiative.

Atherton

Within the recommendations now, that have come before this group as a whole, are what amounts to conflicting recommendations as far as impetus and initiative to carry on is concerned. I would like to suggest--and Dave, being so well organized has probably already thought of this--how we might finally come up with the final recommendation and conclusions that could be approved by the group as a whole. It becomes extremely difficult to do that kind of editing on the floor as we are trying to do now. If we as a group could at least approach the possibility of Dave, with an ad hoc recommendations committee, redrafting our conclusions and recommendations so that they would be based on the consensus of this group. If the power were more or less in that group's hands to get rid of some of the contradictory recommendations, this would do us a favor.

Mitchell

I hope that a few of us can meet afterwards and produce a draft that would be sent to all participants.

Atherton

That's not necessary. I think parliamentary procedure would agree that you were the conference organizer, and that whatever committee you work with is all that you have to have to get something approved by us.

Mitchell

The committee should be known to all of us. Also I think we should get some of the contradictory points ironed out and discussed right here.

Atherton

That's why I'm staying on my feet so that I can at least bring this one out. You heard our recommendation last, so you can probably remember it. In Group A there is a tone of ALA taking responsibility for several activities, and also in Group 1. Group 2 says UNESCO and IFLA take responsibility for initiating international bibliographic control, and Group 3 says ALA should undertake the leadership in securing human resources. I will be quite honest. The silence of ALA yesterday prompts me to say that I don't think we should look to ALA to assume a responsibility that they have not assumed since 1876. The initiative, I think, is still in the hands of the people who are willing to commit themselves from this point forward as an informal group in order to cut the bonds that bind us, in order to cross this field of information and library science. Our own professional organizations are still strait-jacketed a little bit, and they do have other purposes and priorities; so that in this one area I think local initiative is necessary--and then let them get on the bandwagon that we formulate here. We are very interested in getting moving.

Lawson

I think this is true. I have been at so many meetings, and groups of interested people have gotten together and come up with excellent recommendations which they have shunted off onto some other group. Certainly ALA is involved, yet they have not actually been participating here today and yesterday. I think we could initiate a committee, from the conference here, that knows what is going on. A great deal of communication has been established in the last two days. I think that just trying to throw this over to someone else and to hope that they are going on with it is wrong. It is so important, and we do not want this to be totally ineffective after the great deal of time that has been spent here and the things that have arisen.

Reagan

I am from the Library Education Division of ALA. I did not say anything yesterday because we were talking a little bit about past history. You have spoken about the fact that ALA was not participating. I don't know what to say. I can say at this time that ALA is very much interested in bibliographic organization and control. I think the fact that we are a co-sponser of this meeting shows that. I cannot speak for all the Divisions of ALA, I can speak for the Executive Board of ALA, but not for all the members who make up the American Library Association. It is not just the people who are at Huron Street. I do think that certainly ALA is involved in this problem and is interested, and whether ALA does it or someone else does it, it is extremely important to us. I think I speak for the members of ALA that do want to give whatever assistance and support that we can to whatever comes out of this conference, and if there are recommendations directed to ALA, I am sure that the appropriate division will take those on and do what they can about them.

Reed

As a former ALA executive secretary, I want to say LED does speak for ALA in the field of Library Education, of course. And the library school librarians seem to me to be at the very heart of library education. The fact that ALA has been willing to send representatives to the various meetings that have been called is an indication of ALA's interest. I think oftentimes we forget about the amount of money that goes into staff work that is not in big headlines but is continuing. I really can speak about this over quite a period of time. Knowing Miss Reagan, who is the current Executive Secretary of LED is here and will be in an excellent position to speak for ALA on many of these subjects, is something we should not overlook.

Mitchell

There are two points I would like to mention. I think it was Group Four that mentioned that library school librarians should organize within ALA in a continuing effort to cooperate. You know there is a special committee in LED of library school librarians that was set up because there was no provision for discussion groups. The by-laws are in the way of being revised. It looks like after this June the committee will disband and become an official discussion group for library school librarians. But this is a discussion group, and as chairman of the present committee, I think I can tell you frankly it has no pressure and no power; it is a discussion group that provides an opportunity for library school librarians to get together. It will go on, but I think we can take it out of our discussion right now. It will exist at the annual conference once a year for those people who can get to it. I do not think it is centrally involved in this contradiction as to who is going to receive this burden of implementing our recommendations: ALA, UNESCO, or a special international committee that starts from a committee appointed here, or some other organization that has been mentioned.

Holley

I am speaking for Group A. I don't think that we had in mind necessarily ALA. We deliberately left the proposal vague as to who might carry out some of these recommendations, except for the one that seemed to us to go directly to the Office of Education. If I remember the deliberation correctly, it was thought by some of us at least that Recommendation One might well become the responsibility of a scholar in a library school who would seek funds from the Office of Education. There are a host of jealousies involved any time you go this route; that's why we suggested the Office of Education. None of this was designed to put this on the back of anybody particularly.

Logically of course Recommendation Two should come from ALA whose journals are currently duplicating each other in their reviews and omitting a fair amount of material that needs reviewing. At least a couple of us have had experience with Contemporary Psychology over a period of time, and it does a superb job. If we had something like this, librarians would be fortunate indeed. As to who should undertake this, I don't think we have any preconceived ideas. And the same would be true for Recommendation Three for the annual review of librarianship. We were concerned with the fact that a good many people other than the distinguished scholars represented by this relatively small group at this conference have access to a review of various classes of librarianship at least once a year.

There was a strong feeling on the part of Group A that the first responsibility would be to strengthen the major base which we have at the current time, which is Library Literature, and I am quite sure I express the feeling of the group that this is a primary consideration. We don't care how this comes about as long as it comes about.

And now speaking personally on this business, the idea of the formation of another group, or another committee, or another whatever, does not impress me at all; and I am afraid that we have far too much of this kind of confusion in our field. We must recognize the bureaucracy of ALA is probably inevitable when you have some 37,000 members. But there does seem to be a trend, even among the law librarians, toward moving into some closer relationship to the mainstream of library activities in this country. We might more effectively spend our time urging ALA to be the kind of scholarly organization that the APA and some of these other groups have developed into over a period of time. So my personal view is that this separate committee is likely to be a dead-end.

Batty

Perhaps I can add that all these points were discussed this morning; but again, let me return to the provision of something like a comprehensive indexing service. We began by saying something very much like Recommendation Four in Group A's paper, that Library Literature was a strong tool already, but it needed to be extended and broadened and that kind of thing. The discussion on this involves some consideration of just how large the core of material should be. For instance, using journal lists we considered actual figures on this and began to wonder how far a commercial organization like the H. W. Wilson Company could go in handling the size and scope that we would feel necessary to make Library Literature, or something like it, the fully comprehensive indexing service which is so badly needed. For that reason we began to think of some other kind of organization. We began to cast about for the right kind of organization. We considered most of them that we could think of, not only in this country but outside. We considered moving the Wilson Company bodily from one end of the country to the other. We considered moving other institutions from one country and putting them beside the H. W. Wilson Company. We considered others up to and including the Library of Congress and down to, as it were, the major individual library schools. All these things seemed to offer only a partial solution. It was for this reason that we came round to deciding that an international study group on information patterns was the first step and that everything else could base itself on that.

Hines

I'd like to tell a true fairy tale. Once upon a time my mother, the H. W. Wilson Company, ahead of itself in time, produced an index for a newer form of media, the Educational Film Index. They worked ahead of their time, and they carried it for a long period, but it did not become realistic and viable. They had some discussion about what to do. It was concluded that they should put this in the hands of a professional concern. Committees and groups got together and accumulated enough money to have floated the old index for "x" years, and they expanded the scope and produced the greatest bibliographic organization ever which was known as the Educational Media Index. They managed to get into trouble a publisher which had nothing to do with the editorial concern, a firm which had never done an index and didn't know anything about indexing. The new improved index was worse than the now defunct one.

What I would hope is that we would not lose what we have, that we would stop arguing from poverty; stop trying to get somebody to do it on a tiny scale. There is enough money going into research in libraries. If we had a quarter of one per cent of that money and could devote it to bibliography, we'd have so much more money than is presently invested. I hope we can go on as an interested group getting something out of this committee or that organization; our concern as a working group should be to get something started and get something viable and push it along and get money for it. You know we need this thing badly. Don't give it to ALA; let us do it.

Shera

We've got the ALA; we've got other organizations, why not use them? Why go create something else to die?

Harris

Well, I'm a great joiner of maverick groups, unaffiliated groups, usually because I'm not asked to join the formal organizations. I would only say that I'm all for this independent study group. I'm glad to see any group that's interested like this come together, but I think I'm going to have to definitely agree with Dean Shera and say that all my efforts, at least, will be directed towards trying to impel the ALA through their different divisions to organize and support this activity. I don't see really how we can work outside of these professional organizations. They, after all, are the body of the profession and I think we're going to have to work through them.

Every time I hear a complaint about the inability of the ALA to move on these things, I agree again with Dean Shera, "They are us or we are them," and the thing that's necessary, of course, is to get on the ball here and start pushing, and I think we can do it. Certainly, we've got the leaders of ALA scattered all throughout this illustrious body here, and I think that certainly with the interest and concern that everyone here has, that we should go back to every division of ALA and be well represented. So I hope that we will work through ALA and other professional groups in this country, and I also encourage independent study groups to go ahead and work on this thing, and I think that we can all get together on this sooner or later.

Knapp

The power of group belonging is awfully strong and I don't want to disagree with Group A, but I must say that I am very much in favor of this international study group. The thing about it is, it seems to me, that there are two or three or four levels of activity that probably ought to go on at once. I don't think we can stop thinking about improving whatever kind of bibliographic tools we have now. Nor can we stop thinking about ways of developing new ones, such as this reviewing medium that we were talking about, while we wait for an independent and international study group to decide what the whole system ought to be. I see no reason why both things can't go on at once.

Now, with regard to ALA as a hindrance or help, I think this should not be a matter of blaming anybody. As Miss Reagan pointed out, ALA is not just East Huron Street; neither is it just "us." It is an organization of professionals all over this country and Canada, and it involves people with all kinds of different axes to grind. I think it does a marvelous job of creating a sense of professional organization, creating a real degree of consensus. But I think it's not a study group, and that it's not good for studying. And I think it's not a research group, and it's not good for research. I would like to see that the request go from this conference to the Office of Education for a request for proposals in this area, also happening at the same time as the international study group studies the problem. I see no reason why we need to worry about, in this affluent society, a little duplication of thought about something that we're all so concerned about.

Atherton

I'm glad Jesse Shera and I have been carrying on a kind of battle and a love affair at the same time for many years now. Because Jesse said he's seen study groups, international study groups, come and go; and yet he still with great nostalgia remembers the Dorking Conference, which was the first international study group on classification research.* What came of it? A publication, for one. For myself, I became vitally interested in classification when I realized that a conference like this could be held; that people were thinking new thoughts about classification; that there are people like Ranganathan and Shera and Foskett and Vickery that existed, who could talk to each other and yell at each other because they were brought together; and it served as the basis for the initiative that I was part of, to form the second international study group on classification research, so that people in automation who weren't invited to the first could be brought in on the second.

---

*International Study Conference on Classification for Information retrieval, 1957. Dorking, England.

So I guess I'm saying that there is a function at the grass roots level that can be performed by such a group. I agree with Ed Holley, and this is the way I felt when I made this suggestion that we volunteer before we left that table this morning. I also thought that it is still going to have to fall on one person to get something like this going. But it shouldn't be one person who is isolated from his peers. And so some one person, probably me with my big mouth, will walk into O. E. and suggest--or Dave will -- and suggest that some money be funded à la APA for our own field. But it's nice to know that we can call upon our friends who are here and ask them to help us through the second, third or fourth draft of the proposal that will finally culminate in a research project, which one scholar or a team of scholars will have to do.

I can see us going to Garvey of John Hopkins and asking him as a sub-contract to take on our field now that he's finished with psychology, astronautics, optics and a few other of the hard and soft sciences. This is a man, Dr. Garvey, who has gone on from APA to consider scientific communication his sphere of interest. And why he hasn't come to us yet and said, don't you want to be studied, is probably because he hasn't thought of us, and we haven't thought to ask him.

So all I'm saying is, I don't see a real conflict here. I heartily approve of being a member of ALA and working within the ALA, if we have objectives that fit their priorities and their objectives as a group. I heartily recommend yet another journal that would be a reviewing journal for our field, so that there wouldn't be as much duplication and scattering of the effort toward reviewing of monographic literature here.

There are other things that ALA can do, but I have to agree with Pat, knowing what it was like to try to get the Classification Research Study Group going in this country, that to try and get it through the ALA hierarchy was enough to kill it before it started. So we decided to stay independent.

Stevens

I would like to support, too, the idea of the international study group. I feel this has been one. It has been international. We've studied the problem of bibliographic control with perhaps more talent than any other group of people has before, and if the work can be continued, I'm heartily in favor of it.

Reed

I just have one more postscript to make. I agree with both Pauline and Pat that all of these things should be happening at one time. It's always difficult to tell where the yeastiness is for new ideas and critical evaluations which must be done on a continuing basis. And I'm very sure that any group that was working to establish a service, or experimental program or services, would be responsive to the results of work done by any group that had contributions to make. I have learned many times through bitter experience that, for instance, you can't plan for a program of the scope that we have in mind over a two year period. You've got to do long-range planning with organizations that have continuing funds, not with organizations which are funded for a year, and then at their own convenience and not yours. You must have long-term programming for continuing programs of the scope that we have in mind. No programming is successful unless it really pays for bodies that are competent and committed to a certain frame of reference, certain parameters of the problem, and supported by adequate staffing. These are--I know this is elementary--but these are things that sometimes, in getting entranced with ideas, we fail to cope with in terms of practicalities.

McFarland

We've been talking about very practical things, and we've been talking about study groups that may take a year to even come up with recommendations. I think the original proposal I made in my paper--to consolidate all library school acquisition lists--was not necessarily viable. I think it might absorb too much money and take up too much time. I say this in view of the fact that the different groups seem to have had different feelings on this. There certainly is no consensus. For those who are willing to try this on a smaller level, I did want to mention one thing that Tom Little brought up this morning. He suggested that all the schools who don't put out acquisition lists might send me the citations of very obscure and hard-to-get items. I am still willing to include these in the Case-Reserve list and to send them around. We'll try this and see how long it works.

Harris

It's so rare that we get all of these graduate school library school librarians together, that I'd like to take a moment or so to hammer home a few more points in relation to my personal interests.

I think you've all made the point, and it's very encouraging, that we need to collect more primary resources in library school libraries. I make this point and say it again because you are the only people, the library school librarians, the only ones that are concerned with this problem at all. Things like your manuscripts of important alumni from the library schools--I think that each one of you can probably name ten or twelve people that have important papers that should be collected--things like annual reports and other documents collected on a regional basis. I hope that if you do collect things like this that you'll make them known to the profession. I suggest strongly that you get in touch with Dr. Zachert, with the Journal of Library History at Florida State University, who is very interested in any projects developed on this basis. I'm sure she would give notice to any manuscript collections, or developments in this area, in the Journal of Library History.

Atherton

Mike just triggered something that happened to me this year that I want to tell you, both as library school faculty and as library school librarians. Clare Schultz, at Drexel, had an assignment in her class in search strategy of all things, which included a biography of a living pioneer or worker in the field of information science and documentation. And her students were asked to contact a living individual, the one whom they would choose for their term project, and to interview him, either in writing or in person, in order to collect the longest bibliography that probably could be collected for him as of that moment.

I was one of them, and I'm sure I was on it because I'm a worker and not a pioneer. I don't know of anything that I've done that is pioneering. The fellow who interviewed me never saw me. We handled it all over the telephone and by mail. And he wrote as a final term project a "Conversation with Pauline Atherton" in which he documented my answers to such questions as why isn't there better cooperation between the field of information science and library science, and who were the four persons that influenced you in developing your career. He then wrote to them and got comments on me from them. He also collected the bibliography of the work I've done in the last five years at the American Institute of Physics, something I would never have taken time to do, and tried to keep up to date with what I'm doing presently.

I think this is the kind of thing that might be encouraged, because I, for one, as a library school student, enjoyed reading those little pamphlets on pioneers in librarianship that came out quite a while ago. And I'm mentioning it as a way of collecting the resource material or primary material on people in the field, so we don't lose Pete Luhn and Mortimer Taube, for instance, before this can be done.

Lawson

All right, I think that we have several items here that we should really make some decision on. I'm not too sure that there's as much conflict as we seemed to demonstrate for a short time there; but there was a definite recommendation from one group that they be this international study committee. Then there's been another recommendation that Dave Mitchell appoint an ad hoc committee from the participants here. And my understanding would be that these committees would identify the agencies in ALA or in IFLA or OE, or whatever might be the relevant ones, to move ahead on some of the general proposals and projects that we have definitely recommended here. Is there a conflict? Ted.

Hines

I think to a mild degree Mr. Batty gave a false impression of our group deliberations, because to some extent there has been an overemphasis of this international study group. What we did was to distinguish what we felt were a number of highly practical things that went into this succession of bibliographic services we envisioned. We felt that with the amount of time at our disposal, it would be impossible for us to give more than a bare outline of this. Obviously you have things like developing journals to be covered, etc. So we concluded that before you could get down to the nuts and bolts, there would have to be some committee that developed this type of information at some length, that it should include representatives of operating groups and interested parties at "a" point, but exactly when that would arrive, I don't know. We felt that the initial group probably ought to be something that continued out of this as a growth thing. Our emphasis was not, however, on the group, on the study group thing, except as an outgrowth of what we had to say about the organization of the services.

I don't think that there's any disagreement about the organization of the services. We may perhaps have overemphasized what we meant by the group as we went along. Nor would there be any implication that we would not include at a later date representatives of all the library associations with an interest. We just did not, I think, want to leave this something like: okay, we deliberated, we brought forth something, we couldn't give the detail to the bibliographic structure that was really required, but we'll go ahead and hand this to somebody like ALA and say, please won't you do it?

Mitchell

I take it that the volunteer group is not closed, that it's still open to volunteers. Group A was never asked, for one thing. We have inadvertently created two cultures here.

Batty

Perhaps I should have said that there was a Group B that had offered to hold themselves available for serving on a body of this kind. I'm glad Ted Hines said what he did.

I had not intended to overemphasize the international study group. Indeed it occupies one paragraph in itself, out of something like ten. I would like to emphasize that we were concerned with the provision of services. We are concerned with the provision of indexing services, current services, bibliographic control of one kind or another, up to and including the state-of-the-art report.

Mitchell

Venable, could we have some help? There have been two suggestions: One for an editing committee to decide on the final form of the resolutions and another for an ad hoc committee that would point to the organizations, such as ALA or divisions of ALA, to implement recommendations on certain matters, such as the book reviewing journal and that sort of thing. How should we constitute these? Can they be one committee? Shall we appoint it here or shall we say how it is to be constituted and how it is to be appointed? Is it to be the coordinator and the two moderators and myself and one other member from each of Group A and Group B, or what?

Lawson

I would suggest that the coordinator, the moderators, and the four group leaders and yourself, of course, remain for a short time and formalize a group made up of participants. I think this might be worthwhile, and it would give certain guidelines for what we want from this.

First of all, I think we can synthesize these proposals, and I don't believe this will be too difficult. I don't think there are conflicts here. They're really not here. Am I wrong? Am I right? It'll take a little time, but it can be done. And I think it should be done. It is important that there should be some consensus, some direction from this meeting. It would be a terrible waste if we didn't go away feeling we have some direction to move in now and that we have a group that will lead us in this direction and identify the different agencies that can support us. I think this is vital, and I think this is something that a hundred of us can't do at this point. It would be a waste of time.

[A motion was made, and seconded that the coordinator, the two moderators, the four discussion leaders, and the original planning committee for the conference meet together to synthesize proposals, and give direction for the future.]

Voice

Is this committee supposed to formulate the proposals, the recommendations that have been made and, am I correct, send them to all the delegates here? Is that the way it is?

Lawson

No, I would say they are hoping to synthesize. You will not see them until the final proceedings are published, I would assume. Dave?

Mitchell

It will be some time before the final proceedings are published. I will have a summary report as quickly as we can, to get out to everybody here and to everyone else we wanted particularly to get to. But yes, you would see it then, and I hope that would be quite soon.

Atherton

If I understand it, this takes care of the formal writing of the conclusions and recommendations of this conference. And this is also a group to whom we as a conference are giving the initiative to implement what we consider to be positive and firm recommendations to the interested groups that can act because they're in positions of responsibility.

I don't think this motion, if I understand it properly, covers the recommendation of Group B for the formation of an international study group which, if it had any kind of push from this conference, would take on the function of a parallel effort similar to the original APA project.

Lawson

Dave, do you want to answer that?

Mitchell

No, except that in the final form of the conference recommendations we expect that there will be the expression for formation of this study group.

Lawson

It has to be there.

Voice

This group does not constitute the study group?

Mitchell

No, oh no. As I see it now, that's a completely voluntary group as far as any names go, and to which should be added, I would hope, before we leave, any other volunteers. Is that right?

Batty

Yes.

Lawson

All right. Question on the motion. All in favor, of the motion as read, which it was not, signify by AYE. All opposed.

[THE MOTION WAS CARRIED]

All right, the committee is formed.

Knapp

To clear the air, I'd like to move that this conference endorse immediately the establishment of the international study group, which has been proposed by Group B.

Lawson

Is that seconded? Any questions? Any comments?

Lee

I am Bill Lee from Kentucky and I am questioning whether the committee is being instructed to select a certain group of people for the international study group or is it still open. I think it's still quite confusing to the floor.

Lawson

I believe this is an open committee. Pat?

Knapp

I guess in my motion I said, "as proposed by Group B." And I do not believe their recommendation says specifically that volunteers can be added.

Batty

To quote the recommendation: "Work together towards the establishment of a interantional study group on information patterns has begun. A working party has bee formed"-- because the people in Group A volunteered. This is not the international study group on information patterns. It is the working party towards the establishment of the international study group on information patterns. Now what we meant by this, and what we intended by this, was that we make an act of faith. We believe that the way towards getting bibliographic control of the services that we were discussing this morning was partly, at least, through an international study group of this kind. We would hope that in discussion and resolution here, something of this kind would be endorsed by the conference, but even if it is not, that we would voluntarily give our services to investigate the nature, the composition, and the identity of an international study group of that kind.

Lawson

David, we goofed. We forgot to appoint a parliamentarian. I believe this does indicate that we have a valid motion, and others can volunteer to participate in this committee and so on. Therefore, the motion as read is now before you. Any other discussion?

You are ready for the question?

All in favor of the motion, signify by saying AYE. All opposed.

[THE MOTION WAS CARRIED]

All right the motion is carried. Any other comments, reactions? Pauline, you've got something else to say? All right. You ought to sit in the front row.

Atherton

I just want to be sure that we do the right thing. I have to ask Pat, since I don't remember her motion exactly, if it's meant to endorse the idea. Yes? Then can we assume that implementation will start with the conference planning committee?

Mitchell

Yes, very simply yes. If this is a resolution passed by the conference, then it is a responsibility of the planning committee not only to see that this comes out strongly in the recommendations, but also that we point to how this should be carried forward and see that we get people to carry it forward. I would assume that.

Batty

I shall probably confuse the whole matter over again. But it seems to me now like this. We have a committee which is going to work on the resolutions and say what has been said. The conference as a whole has just endorsed one of the possible resolutions, so that the committee to produce the resolutions, has an instruction that one of them should be the formation of an international study group. We have a working party of unknown size and identity, though we know some of the people, and it is simply a working party. All are welcome. We will simply correspond and chat and things like that with each other, and in doing so, try to find out the best composition of that international study group that we think should be established. So anybody who wishes to involve himself in that activity can do it in a number of ways. He can approach the committee, which is making the resolutions up, or he can approach the people who have already volunteered and say, well, who else is there and what are you all saying to each other. It's as informal as that at the moment. It will presumably harden as it goes along.

Lawson

Any other questions? Comments? David, do you want to say any final words?

Mitchell

If there is nothing else, I would just like to very simply just thank everybody very heartily. It's been very easy to be very nice to people who have been so very helpful to us.

Corrigan

Can I just ask David if he or the planning committee have given any thought as to whom these resolutions would be sent? And the proceedings of the conference?

Mitchell

The summary, as I said, will be sent to all members of this conference to begin with and to anyone else to whom this committee that's just been constituted decides they should go. The actual papers and the proceedings themselves, as edited, which will take some time, will be published later. But the summary proceedings will be sent to everybody here as quickly as possible and to whomever asks for them and to whomever you suggest we should send them.

Lawson

Any other questions or comments?

Shera

Could I bring up such a crass matter as expense accounts? Who do we send them to?

Mitchell

Send them to me, Dr. Shera.

Shera

I hate to be so mercenary.

Mitchell

Send them to me.

Shera

I don't mean to do it. The sacrificial goat.

Mitchell

Send them to me with some reasonable documentation of that enlarged figure.

Atherton

Having been a professional conference goer for over six years now--I attend them now at least once a month--I would like to suggest that we have a standing ovation for the pleasant arrangements we've had here. Everything has been taken care of, so that we have been able to do the impossible and come out with recommendations from five different groups that were so close to being alike.

Mitchell

I just want you to know--and you do realize what I want to say--just how many people there have been behind me on this.

Lawson

Thank you Dave. If there are no more comments, I thank each of you because each of you made this a success by your real contributions.

If there are no other matters, the conference is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the conference was adjourned, on Saturday, April 20, 1968.)

NOTE

In addition to these Proceedings, see also:

A. Summary of Recommendations

B. Short Summary of Papers and Proceedings

C. The Working Papers:

1. Corrigan, Philip R. D. A Model System of Bibliographic Organization for Library Science Literature (January 1968)
2. Harris, Michael H. Fugitive Literature in Library Science: American Library History as a Test Case (December 1967)
3. Herling, John P. and Gerald J. Lazorick. Proposal for a Current Awareness Service for the Literature of Library and Information Science (March 1968)
4. Hines, Theodore C. Vocabulary Control in Indexing the Literature of Librarianship and Information Science (April 1968)
5. Knapp, Patricia B. The Library-Centered Library School (November 1967)
6. Lee, Robert. The Special Collection in Librarianship (December 1967)
7. Little, Thompson. Use and Users of Library Literature (March 1968)
8. McFarland, Anne. Problems in the Awareness and Acquisition of the Monographic Literature of Library Science (December 1967)
9. Osborn, Andrew D. A Dual System for Indexing Library and Information Literature (February 1968)
10. Richmond, Phyllis and Pauline Atherton. Subject Analysis of Library Science Literature by Means of Classification Systems: Outline of Criteria Needed for Evaluation (December 1967)

PARTICIPANTS

ARO (Mrs.) Barbara
University of Iowa
ATHERTON (Mrs.) Pauline author
University of Rochester
BATTY C. David moderator
University of Maryland
BECKER Joseph reactor
Biomedical Communications Project
BERNEIS (Mrs.) Regina F.
Western Michigan University
BRUNO J. M.
University of Oklahoma
CASSADY (Mrs.) Virginia L.
Pratt Institute
CLARK (Mrs.) Jennie B.
Louisiana State University
CORRIGAN Philip R.D. author
College of Librarianship, Wales
DARDARIAN (Mrs.) Gloria L.
Wayne State University
DANFORD (Mrs.) Helen
Florida State University
DULLEA Barbara A.
SUNY at Buffalo
EISENBACH (Mrs.) Elizabeth
UCLA
FLORES Annie T.
Catholic University
GIBSON E. Bernice
University of Wisconsin-Madison
GOODRICH Ann
Rosary College
GRIFFIN Margaret
Indiana University
HALL Mary
McGill University
HARRIS Michael H. author
Indiana University
HEINZKILL J. Richard
University of Oregon
HERLING John P. author
SUNY at Buffalo
HINES Theodore C. author
Columbia University
HOLLEY Edward G. reactor
University of Houston
KALDOR Ivan
Kent State University
KINDLIN (Mrs.) Jean
University of Pittsburgh
KNAPP (Mrs.) Patricia author
Wayne State University
LAUER Evelyn
Columbia University
LAW Nicholas
University of Minnesota
LAWSON A. Venable co-ordinator
Emory University
LAZORICK Gerald J. author
SUNY at Buffalo
LEE Robert author
Kansas State Teachers College
LEE William
University of Kentucky
LIPETZ Ben-Ami
Documentation Abstracts
LITCHFIELD (Mrs.) Lucile
Kansas State Teachers College
LITTLE Thompson M. author
Hofstra University
LUIK (Mrs.) Asta
University of Toronto
MCFARLAND (Mrs.) Anne author
Case Western Reserve University
MADDEN Jean
Simmons College
NEESE Janet
SUNY College at Geneseo
OSBORN Andrew D. author
University of Western Ontario
PARKER (Mrs.) Lucretia
Atlanta University
PURDY Victor M.
Brigham Young University
RALSTON Pauline
Syracuse University
REELING (Mrs.) Patricia
Rutgers University
RICHMOND (Mrs.) Phyllis author
University of Rochester
SAWYER (Mrs.) Ruth
University of Texas
SHERA Jesse reactor
Case Western Reserve University
SIMONTON Wesley reactor
University of Minnesota
STEVENS Jane moderator
H. W. Wilson Company
STONE Ruth E.
University of North Carolina
THACKSTON Frances V.
University of Maryland
THOMPSON Gladys
Southern Connecticut State Coll.
WADSWORTH Robert
University of Chicago
WARRINGTON Carol
Northern Illinois University
WHATLEY H. Allan
Library Science Abstracts
WITCHER (Mrs.) Caroline
University of Michigan
ZIFFER (Mrs.) Shirley
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

2

CONFERENCE OFFICIALS
and
OFFICIAL OBSERVERS

COLBURN Edwin B. planning committee
H. W. Wilson Foundation
FARLEY John J.
SUNY at Albany
HASTINGS Alice T.
SUNY at Albany
LOMBARDI Mary
H. W. Wilson Company
MITCHELL David planning committee
SUNY at Albany
REAGAN Agnes L.
ALA-LED
REED Sarah Rebecca
University of Alberta
SCOTT Edith
Library of Congress
TAYLOR Marion R. planning committee
ALA-Library Education Division
VORMELKER Rose L.
ALA-LED
WHITE Ruth
American Library Association

If you have any questions, please contact any member of the planning committee or hospitality staff.

2

CONFERENCE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE LITERATURE

April 19-20, 1968
Albany, New York

Sponsored by the American Library Association, the H. W. Wilson Foundation, and the State University of New York at Albany.

****

FRIDAY, APRIL 19

8:00 Breakfast (Patroon Room)

9:00 Welcome and Ground Rules (Ballrm.)

Alice T. Hastings, Director,
SUNYA University Library

Webb S. Fiser, Vice-President
for Academic Affairs, SUNYA

David L. Mitchell, Chairman
Conference Planning Committee

A. Venable Lawson,
Conference Co-ordinator

9:30 Library Services (Ballroom)

CLOSED TO PUBLIC

Moderator: Jane Stevens

Reactors: Jesse Shera
Edward Holley

Authors: Patricia Knapp
Robert Lee
Thompson Little
Michael Harris
Anne McFarland

11:45 Luncheon (Ballroom)

1:00 Bibliographic Organization (Ballrm)

CLOSED TO PUBLIC

Moderator: David Batty

Reactors: Wesley Simonton
Joseph Becker

Authors: Philip Corrigan
John Herling and
Gerald Lazorick
Andrew Osborn
Ted Hines
Pauline Atherton and
Phyllis Richmond

3:00 Coffee (Ballroom)

3:30 Open Discussion of Papers and Issues (Ballroom)

OPEN TO PUBLIC

All invited participants may direct questions to the panel of authors and reactors

Moderator: David Mitchell

7:00 Reception for all invited participants and official observers (Patroon Lounge)

CLOSED TO PUBLIC

7:30 Dinner (Ballroom)

SATURDAY, APRIL 20

8:00 Breakfast (Patroon Room)

9:00 Small Group Work Session (Ballrm.)

CLOSED TO PUBLIC

Each group, under the direction of its moderator or discussion leader, will formulate proposals for improving library or indexing services for librarianship. Duplicating services will be available at the information desk on the first floor of the Campus Center. (Coffee available in Ballroom all morning).

11:45 Luncheon (Ballroom)

1:00 Final Session (Ballroom)

OPEN TO PUBLIC

Presentation of proposals for improving bibliographic control of library science literature

Presiding: Conference Co-ordinator

Reporting: Moderators and Discussion Leaders

Discussion: All Invited Participants

There will be a time limit on discussion of each proposal.

Written copies of each proposal will be distributed. Each participant will be asked to return them, with comments, to the conference office within one week. The vote of each participant on each proposal will be recorded upon receipt of the returns.

3:00 Adjournment